arXiv:1107.0524v3 [math.NA] 13 Aug 2011

Adaptive boundary element methods with convergence rates

Tsogtgerel Gantumur

McGill University

Abstract

This paper presents adaptive boundary element methods for positive, negative, as well as zero order operator equations, together with proofs that they converge at certain rates. The convergence rates are quasi-optimal in a certain sense under mild assumptions that are analogous to what is typically assumed in the theory of adaptive finite element methods. In particular, no saturation-type assumption is used. The main ingredients of the proof that constitute new findings are some results on *a posteriori* error estimates for boundary element methods, and an inverse-type inequality involving boundary integral operators on locally refined finite element spaces.

1 Introduction

Let Γ be a (closed or open) polyhedral surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$. We consider equations of the form

$$Au = f, \tag{1}$$

where $f \in H^{-t}(\Gamma)$, and $A : H^t(\Gamma) \to H^{-t}(\Gamma)$ is an invertible linear operator. Strictly speaking, the function spaces should be slightly modified if Γ is an open surface or $t > 0$, but for the sake of this introduction we will gloss over this point. The operators of interest are the *boundary integral operators* that arise from reformulations of boundary value problems as integral equations on the domain boundary, cf. McLean (2000). Then the problem (1) corresponds to a *boundary integral equation*, and a very popular class of methods for its numerical solution is *boundary element methods* (BEM), which can crudely be described as finite element methods applied to boundary integral equations, cf. Sauter and Schwab (2011). As with finite elements, there is the *adaptive* version of BEM, whose main feature is to automatically distribute mesh points hopefully in an optimal way so as to obtain an accurate numerical solution. Even though those methods perform very well in practice, their mathematical theory is in a not very satisfactory state, especially if one compares it with the corresponding theory of adaptive finite element methods. In the latter context, the sequence of papers Dörfler (1996), Morin, Nochetto, and Siebert (2002), Binev, Dahmen, and DeVore (2004), Stevenson (2007), and Cascon, Kreuzer, Nochetto, and Siebert (2008) has laid a fairly satisfactory foundation to mathematical understanding of adaptive finite element methods for linear elliptic boundary value problems. Specifically, it was established that standard adaptive finite element methods generate a sequence of solutions whose error decreases geometrically, and that the number of triangles in the mesh grows with an optimal rate. Moreover, rigorous treatments of numerical integration and linear algebra solvers are within reach.

However, there has been a significant gap in the current mathematical understanding of adaptive BEM. The first steps toward closing the gap have been taken in Carstensen and Praetorius (2009), where convergence is guaranteed for an adaptive BEM with a feedback control that occasionally adds uniform refinements, in Ferraz-Leite, Ortner, and Praetorius (2010) where geometric error reduction is proven under a *saturation assumption*, and in Aurada, Ferraz-Leite, and Praetorius (2011), where convergence is established under a weak saturation-type assumption. To give an idea of what a saturation assumption is, one form of it requires that if u_k is the numerical solution of (1) at the current stage of the algorithm execution, and if $\hat{u}_k$ is the would-be numerical solution had we replaced the current mesh by its uniform refinement, then $\|u - u_k\|_{H^t(\Gamma)} \leq \beta \|\hat{u}_k - u_k\|_{H^t(\Gamma)}$, where $\beta > 0$ is a constant. Such assumptions were common in finite element literature before Dörfler (1996) and Morin et al. (2002) proved geometric error reduction without relying on a saturation assumption.

In this paper, we prove geometric error reduction for three kinds of adaptive boundary element methods for positive ($t > 0$), negative ($t < 0$), as well as zero order operator equations, without using a saturation-type assumption. In fact, several types of saturation assumptions follow from our work as a corollary. Moreover, bounds on the convergence rates are obtained that are in a certain sense optimal.

During the final stage of this work, and independently of it, a preprint Feischl, Karkulik, Melenk, and Praetorius (2011) appeared in which the authors announced a proof of certain optimality result for an adaptive BEM for a negative order operator equation, based on the *a posteriori* error estimator from Carstensen, Maischak, and Stephan (2001). Details are not given, but the general outline shows some similarity with our main line of reasoning.

A large chunk of the techniques developed in the adaptive finite element theory is not specific to differential equations, providing a nice starting point for us and a clue on what ingredients are missing in the boundary element theory. In this work, we needed to supply two kinds of ingredients that constitute new findings: some results on *a posteriori* error estimators for BEM and an inverse-type inequality involving boundary integral operators and locally refined meshes. The issue with the theory of error estimators has been most obvious; what is usually guaranteed is only one of the two inequalities that are necessary for a quantity to resemble the error. There is a very few estimators with both *upper and lower bounds* proven; one can mention the estimators proposed in Faermann (1998, 2000, 2002), see Carstensen and Faermann (2001) for a more thorough discussion. To name some of the relatively recent works on this subject, we have Carstensen, Maischak, and Stephan (2001), Carstensen, Maischak, Praetorius, and Stephan (2004), and Nochetto, von

Petersdorff, and Zhang (2010), where upper bounds for certain residual-type estimators are established, and Erath, Ferraz-Leite, Funken, and Praetorius (2009a), and Erath, Funken, Goldenits, and Praetorius (2009b), where upper and lower bounds are proven for a large number of non-residual type estimators, with the upper bounds depending on various forms of saturation assumptions. Now, even if one had both upper and lower bounds for an error estimator, one still needs a so-called *local discrete bound* before attempting to apply the general techniques from the finite element theory. Such an estimate has been entirely open for boundary element methods, except the recent claim in Feischl et al. (2011) regarding the residual-type estimator from Carstensen et al. (2001).

In this work, we establish all missing bounds for a number of residual-type error estimators for positive, negative, as well zero order boundary integral equations, including the estimators from Carstensen et al. (2001), Carstensen et al. (2004), and Faermann (2000, 2002). Some of our bounds contain the so-called *oscillation terms*, that give useful estimates on how far the current mesh is from saturation. Note that analogous terms also arise in the finite element theory. In order to handle the oscillation terms, which turned out to be much more involved than the corresponding affairs in the finite element context, we prove an *inverse-type inequality* involving boundary integral operators and locally refined meshes. A special case of this inequality has been announced in Feischl et al. (2011). Our proof of the inverse-type inequality in general requires the underlying surface Γ to be $C^{1,1}$ or smoother, but for open surfaces it allows the boundary of Γ to be Lipschitz. So in general, polyhedral surfaces are ruled out, which is likely an artifact of the proof, and will hopefully be rectified in the near future.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we fix the general setting of the paper, and recall some basic results that will be used throughout the paper. Then in the following three sections, namely in §3, §4, and §5, we consider adaptive BEMs for zero, positive, and negative order operator equations, respectively. In each of the three cases, we first study certain residual based *a posteriori* error estimators, then design an adaptive BEM based on those estimators, and finally address the question of convergence rate. There are some general arguments and remarks that can be applied to all of the three cases, and so in order not to be too repetitive, they shall be discussed in §3 for the zero order case in detail, and then in §4 and §5, we will simply refer to them if needed. The entire analysis depends on an inverse-type inequality involving boundary integral operators and locally refined meshes, which then is verified in §6 for a general class of boundary integral operators. We will conclude the paper by summarizing the results and making a list of important open problems.

2 Generalities

In this section, we will set up the necessary vocabulary and collect some basic results that will be used throughout the paper. Let Ω be a compact closed, n-dimensional, patchwise smooth, globally $C^{\nu-1,1}$ manifold, which will be the habitat of all functions and distributions that ever occur in this paper. In practice, we typically have $n=1$ or $n=2$, so in the discussions that follow we often use the language of $n=2$, and we shall indicate whenever we lose generality by implicitly restricting to the case $n=2$. We will assume that each smooth (closed) patch of Ω is diffeomorphic to a polygon, so one can think of Ω as the surface of a bounded polyhedron, with faces and edges now allowed to be smooth surfaces and curves, respectively. For $s\in[-\nu,\nu]$, we denote by $H^s(\Omega)$ the usual Sobolev space of order s on Ω. Let $\omega\subseteq\Omega$ be an open subset of Ω with Lipschitz boundary. Then we define the following two kinds of Sobolev spaces

$$H^s(\omega)=\{u|_\omega : u\in H^s(\Omega)\}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{H}^s(\omega)=\{u\in H^s(\Omega) : \operatorname{supp} u\subseteq\overline{\omega}\}, \tag{2}$$

for $s\in[-\nu,\nu]$. Obviously $\tilde{H}^s(\Omega)=H^s(\Omega)$, and it is known that $\tilde{H}^s(\omega)^*=H^{-s}(\omega)$, cf. McLean (2000). Note also that $\tilde{H}^s(\omega)$ is a closed subspace of $H^s(\omega)$ for $s\geq 0$. The definitions (2) give rise to the canonical norms on $H^s(\omega)$ and $\tilde{H}^s(\omega)$ inherited from the norm on $H^s(\Omega)$, and at least for $s>0$, these norms are known to be equivalent to certain norms defined either by interpolation, or in terms of moduli of smoothness, with the equivalence constants depending only on the dimension n, the order s, the Lipschitz constant of ω, and the particulars (i.e., the local coordinate patches and the partition of unity) in the definition of $H^s(\Omega)$. Let us expand on this a bit. Since the spaces with $s>1$ are of secondary importance to us, for simplicity here we focus only on the case $s\in[0,1]$, hence by duality on $|s|\leq 1$. With $\|\cdot\|_\omega$ and $|\cdot|_{1,\omega}$ denoting the L^2-norm and the usual H^1-seminorm on ω, respectively, we define $|\cdot|_{H^s(\omega)}$ to be the interpolatory seminorm between $\|\cdot\|_\omega$ and $|\cdot|_{1,\omega}$, for concreteness by using the K-functional. Then $\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{H}^s(\omega)}:=|\cdot|_{H^s(\omega)}$ is a norm on $\tilde{H}^s(\omega)$, which can be made into a norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^s(\omega)}$ on $H^s(\omega)$ by combining it with the L^2-norm. It can be shown that these norms are equivalent to the canonical norms on $\tilde{H}^s(\omega)$ and respectively $H^s(\omega)$, with equivalence constants depending only on n, s, and the particulars of the definition of $H^s(\Omega)$, cf. McLean (2000). Moreover, we have the following useful property that if $\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_k$ are disjoint Lipschitz domains such that $\bigcup_i\omega_i=\omega$, then for $|s|\leq 1$ we have

$$\sum_i\|u\|^2_{H^s(\omega_i)}\leq C_s\|u\|^2_{H^s(\omega)}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|v\|^2_{\tilde{H}^s(\omega)}\leq C_s\sum_i\|v\|^2_{\tilde{H}^s(\omega_i)}, \tag{3}$$

for $u\in H^s(\omega)$ and $v\in\tilde{H}^s(\omega)$, with the constant $C_s>0$ depending only on s, and the norms for $s<0$ defined by duality, cf. Ainsworth, McLean, and Tran (1999) and von Petersdorff (1989). Another interesting norm on $H^s(\omega)$ for $s\in(0,1)$, is the *Slobodeckij norm*

$$\|v\|^2_{s,\omega}=\|v\|^2_\omega+|v|^2_{s,\omega}, \qquad \text{with} \qquad |v|^2_{s,\omega}=\iint\limits_{\omega\times\omega}\frac{|v(x)-v(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{2+2s}}\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y, \tag{4}$$

where $\|v\|_\omega$ denotes the L^2-norm on ω. It is immediate that if $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_k$ are disjoint and Lebesgue measurable sets such that $\bigcup_i \omega_i \subseteq \omega$, then for $s > 0$ we have

$$\sum_i |v|^2_{s,\omega_i} \leq |v|^2_{s,\omega}, \qquad v \in H^s(\omega), \tag{5}$$

which is the counterpart of the first inequality in (3). The seminorms $|\cdot|_{H^s(\omega)}$ and $|\cdot|_{s,\omega}$ are equivalent, with the equivalence constants depending only on n, s, the Lipschitz constant of ω, and as usual the particulars of the definition of $H^s(\Omega)$. This fact can be proven as in McLean (2000) by relating the both seminorms to the canonical norms defined through the norm on $H^s(\Omega)$. A more direct way to relate the two seminorms would be to first connect the Slobodeckij seminorm with the Besov-style seminorm defined by moduli of continuity, and then use the equivalence between the moduli of continuity and the K-functional, established in Johnen and Scherer (1977). Note that one has to inspect (and adapt) the proofs in McLean (2000) and Johnen and Scherer (1977) to reveal the relevant information on the equivalence constants. It should be emphasized that since we shall be dealing with an infinite collection of domains, in partiuclar of sizes that can shrink to zero, when using norm equivalences one must be careful about ensuring a control over the equivalence constants. In the current setting, the equivalence constants do not depend on the size of ω, and the Lipschitz constants are controlled by restricting the class of domains to the so-called shape regular triangles, see below (14). In the proofs, we make an effort to use the interpolatory norms for as long as possible, and so to apply the norm equivalence only when necessary.

In the following, we fix $\Gamma \subseteq \Omega$ to be the whole of Ω, or a connected open set whose boundary consists of curved polygons. This will be the domain on which we consider our main operator equation

$$Au = f, \tag{6}$$

where $f \in H^{-t}(\Gamma)$, and $A : \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma) \to H^{-t}(\Gamma)$ is a linear homeomorphism. We assume that the operator A is self-adjoint and satisfies

$$\langle Av, v\rangle \geq \alpha \|v\|^2_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}, \qquad \|Av\|_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)} \leq \beta \|v\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}, \tag{7}$$

for $v \in \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)$, with some constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$, where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the duality pairing between $H^{-t}(\Gamma)$ and $\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)$. We introduce the *energy norm* $|\!|\!|\cdot|\!|\!| = \langle A\cdot,\cdot\rangle^{1/2}$, and note that it is equivalent to the $\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)$-norm

$$\sqrt{\alpha}\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)} \leq |\!|\!|\cdot|\!|\!| \leq \sqrt{\beta}\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}. \tag{8}$$

We also have the norm equivalence

$$\alpha\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)} \leq \|A\cdot\|_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)} \leq \beta\|\cdot\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}, \tag{9}$$

which is the basis of all residual based error estimation techniques.

Suppose that a closed linear subspace $S \subset \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)$ is given. Then the *Galerkin approximation* $u_S \in S$ of u from the space S is characterized by

$$\langle Au_S, v\rangle = \langle f, v\rangle, \qquad \forall v \in S. \tag{10}$$

We have the *Galerkin orthogonality*

$$|\!|\!| u - u_S |\!|\!|^2 + |\!|\!| u_S - v |\!|\!|^2 = |\!|\!| u - v |\!|\!|^2, \qquad \forall v \in S, \tag{11}$$

which implies that u_S is the best approximation of u from S in the energy norm, and that the Galerkin approximation is stable:

$$\sqrt{\alpha}\|u_S\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)} \leq |\!|\!| u_S |\!|\!| \leq |\!|\!| u |\!|\!| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\|f\|_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)}. \tag{12}$$

In light of (9), the residual $r_S = f - Au_S$ is equivalent to the error:

$$\alpha\|u - u_S\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)} \leq \|r_S\|_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)} \leq \beta\|u - u_S\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}. \tag{13}$$

In the sense that the residual is a computable quantity that gives bounds on the true error in terms of this equivalence, the first inequality in (13) is an example of a *global upper bound*, while the second one is that of a *global lower bound*. Upper and lower bounds in this context are also called *reliability* and *efficiency*, respectively.

We study the Galerkin approximation by piecewise constant or continuous piecewise linear functions on adaptively generated triangulations of the manifold Γ. Let us now fix some notations and terminologies related to this discretization. An open subset of Γ is called a *(surface) triangle* if its closure is diffeomorphic to a flat triangle, and the latter is said to be the *reference* of the former. Assuming that a choice is made of a reference for each surface triangle, notions related to flat triangles can be planted onto surface triangles through their references. For instance, in the following, straight lines, midpoint, etc., should be understood in terms of the reference triangles. We call a collection P of surface triangles a *partition* of Γ if $\overline{\Gamma} = \bigcup_{\tau\in P}\overline{\tau}$, and $\tau \cap \sigma = \varnothing$ for any two different $\tau, \sigma \in P$. For refining the meshes we mainly use the so called *newest vertex bisection* algorithm, which we describe now for the reader's convenience. General discussion on this algorithm can be found e.g., in Binev, Dahmen, and DeVore (2004); Stevenson (2008). We assume that with any triangle τ comes its associated newest vertex $v(\tau)$, so that when it is needed to be refined, τ is subdivided into two triangles by connecting $v(\tau)$ with the midpoint of the edge opposite to it. The midpoint used in the bisection is now the newest vertex of the both new triangles. The 2 new triangles so obtained are called the *children* of τ, and the refinement of τ is just the collection of its children. The children of a triangle inherit the reference map from their parent. A partition P' is called a refinement of P and denoted $P \preceq P'$ if P' can be obtained by replacing zero or more $\tau \in P$ by its children, or by a recursive application of this procedure. The newest vertex bisection in 1 dimension is straightforward, and an extension to higher dimensions is treated in Stevenson (2008).

An alternative to the newest vertex bisection is the *red refinement* procedure, which subdivides a triangle into 4 smaller triangles, by connecting the midpoints of the edges with each other. In general, a refinement procedure is a map that assigns to a triangle a collection of disjoint triangles whose union is the original triangle (up to taking closures). The newly created triangles inherit the reference map from their parent. We will assume that there is a universal constant $\lambda_0 < 1$ such that the maximum diameter of the children of a triangle is at most λ_0 times the diameter of the parent. This assumption is easily satisfied for the newest vertex bisection and red refinement procedures. Although one can imagine many different kinds of exotic refinement procedures, we are going to pretend that we have only the afore-mentioned refinement procedures, and their finite powers (e.g., one can perform the red refinement twice on a triangle and call it one refinement). The red refinement is algorithmically the bit simpler one, and a rule of thumb is that we can use the red refinement if we may allow discontinuous functions in our approximating subspace S, and we need the newest vertex bisection if we want only continuous functions in S. However, see Stevenson (2005) for an approach to use the red refinement procedure in the context of continuous approximating subspaces.

A partition P is said to be *conforming* if any vertex v of a triangle in P is a vertex of all $\tau \in P$ whose closure contains v. Throughout this paper we consider only partitions that are refinements of some *fixed* conforming partition P_0 of Γ. We require that the references of the initial partition P_0 be so that for any pair of surface triangles that share a common edge, the parameterizations from the reference triangles to the common edge are equal up to the composition with an affine map. The motivation for this is that we want the refinements on both triangles to agree on the common edge. A choice of refinement procedure immediately leads to the set $[P_0]$ of all partitions that are refinements of P_0. We assume that the family $[P_0]$ is *shape regular*, meaning that

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{s}} = \sup \left\{ \frac{h_\tau^n}{\mathrm{vol}(\tau)} : \tau \in P,\, P \in [P_0] \right\} < \infty, \tag{14}$$

where $h_\tau = \mathrm{diam}(\tau)$. Both the newest vertex bisection and the red refinement procedures produce shape regular partitions. The set $[P_0]$ is too large in the sense that often we are interested in a certain subset of it that has a good property, e.g., we want to single out the conforming partitions from $[P_0]$. Exactly what subset we want depends on the particular setting, and at this level of generality we simply assume that there is a subset $\mathrm{adm}(P) \subset [P_0]$ called the family of *admissible partitions*, which is *graded* (or *locally quasi-uniform*, or have the *K-mesh property*), i.e.,

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{g}} = \sup \left\{ \frac{h_\sigma}{h_\tau} : \sigma, \tau \in P,\, \overline{\sigma} \cap \overline{\tau} \neq \varnothing,\, P \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0) \right\} < \infty. \tag{15}$$

For example, if $n \geq 2$ then the conforming refinements of P_0 produced by the newest vertex bisection are locally quasi-uniform. If $n = 1$ or if the red refinement is used, one can *define* the admissible partitions to be the ones for which the quantity under the supremum in (15) is bounded by a fixed number. Finally, note that the shape regularity and local quasi-uniformity together imply *local finiteness*, meaning that the number of triangles meeting at any given point is bounded by a constant that depends only on σ_{s}, σ_{g}, and n.

Given a partition $P \in [P_0]$, we define the piecewise polynomial space S^d_P by

$$S^d_P = \left\{ u \in L^2(\Gamma) : u \in C(\Gamma) \text{ if } d > 0, \text{ and } u|_\tau \in \mathbb{P}_d \, \forall \tau \in P \right\}, \tag{16}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_d$ denotes the set of polynomials of degree less than or equal to d. Note that for curved triangles, polynomials are defined through the reference triangles. We have $S^d_P \subset H^s(\Gamma)$ for $s < d + \frac{1}{2}$ with $|s| \leq \nu$. Of interest to us are only the spaces S^0_P of piecewise constants and S^1_P of continuous piecewise linears. We will also employ a slight variation of S^1_P, that is the space $\tilde{S}^1_P$ of piecewise affine functions that vanish on the boundary of Γ.

Now we collect some estimates relating different Sobolev norms for finite element spaces and their complements. We will indicate if the constants involved in the estimates depend on parameters (such as σ_{s}) other than d and n. First of all, we recall Faermann's estimate

$$\|v\|^2_{s,\Gamma} \leq C_F \sum_{z \in N_P} |v|^2_{s,\omega(z)}, \qquad v \in H^s(\Gamma),\, v \perp_{L^2} S^d_P, \quad (s \in [0,1]), \tag{17}$$

for all admissible partitions $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, with $C_F = C_F(\sigma_{\mathrm{s}}, \sigma_{\mathrm{g}})$, cf. Faermann (2000, 2002). Here N_P is the set of vertices in P, and $\omega(z) = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\{\tau \in P : z \in \overline{\tau}\}} \overline{\tau}$ is called the *star* associated to the vertex z, with "int" denoting the interior. The same estimate for interpolatory norms has been established in Carstensen, Maischak, and Stephan (2001), by a very flexible technique. We will be using their technique on several occasions in §5.

For a partition $P \in [P_0]$, let $h_P \in S^0_P$ be such that $h_P(x) = h_\tau$ for $x \in \tau \in P$. We introduce the space $H^r(\Gamma, P_0)$ for $r > 0$ as the space of functions $v \in L^2(\Omega)$ with $v|_\tau \in H^r(\tau)$ for every triangle $\tau \in P_0$. Now for $v \in H^s(\Gamma, P_0)$ with $s \in [0,1]$, let $v_P \in S^0_P$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection of v onto S^0_P. Then we have the direct estimate

$$\|v - v_P\|_\tau \leq C_J h^s_\tau |v|_{s,\tau}, \qquad \tau \in P, \tag{18}$$

where the constant $C_J = C_J(\sigma_{\mathrm{s}})$. An immediate consequence is that

$$\|h^r_P(v - v_P)\|^2_\gamma \leq C^2_J \sum_{\tau \in Q} h^{2(r+s)}_\tau |v|^2_{s,\tau}, \tag{19}$$

for $Q \subseteq P$, $\gamma = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in Q} \overline{\tau}$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. By using a duality argument, and the bounds (19) and (5), one can show also that

$$\|v - v_P\|_{\tilde{H}^{-s}(\gamma)} \leq C_J \|h^s_P v\|_\gamma, \qquad v \in L^2(\Gamma). \tag{20}$$

For the continuous piecewise linears, the L^2-projection is nonlocal, and so for convenience we will employ a quasi-interpolation operator $Q_P : L^2(\Gamma) \to \tilde{S}^1_P$ that satisfies

$$\|v - Q_P v\|_{r,\gamma} \leq C_J \left(\max_{\tau \in Q} h_\tau \right)^{s-r} |v|_{s,\omega(\gamma)}, \qquad v \in \tilde{H}^s(\Gamma), \tag{21}$$

for $0 \leq r \leq s \leq 1$ and $P \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$, where $\omega(\gamma) = \mathrm{int} \bigcup_{\{\sigma \in P : \overline{\sigma} \cap \overline{\gamma} \neq \varnothing\}} \overline{\sigma}$, and if $n \geq 2$, $\mathrm{adm}(P_0)$ is understood to be the conforming partitions created by newest vertex bisections from P_0. Recall also that $\tilde{S}^1_P$ is the subspace of S^1_P with the homogeneous boundary condition. By a *quasi-interpolation* we mean that $(Q_P v)|_\tau = (Q_P v|_{\omega(\tau)})|_\tau$. Examples of such operators are constructed, e.g., in Clément (1975); Scott and Zhang (1990); Oswald (1994); Bernardi and Girault (1998). Accordingly, in this setting, the estimate (19) is replaced by

$$\|h^r_P(v - Q_P v)\|^2_\gamma \leq C^2_J \sum_{\tau \in Q} h_\tau^{2(r+s)} |v|^2_{s,\omega(\tau)}. \tag{22}$$

We stated the estimates (18) and (21) in terms of the Slobodeckij norms, but the usual way to derive these estimates is by interpolation and norm equivalences, so in particular the same estimates hold with interpolatory norms.

Let us also recall the inverse estimates

$$\|v\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq C_B \|h_P^{-s} v\|_\gamma, \qquad v \in S^d_P, \tag{23}$$

for $s \in [0, d + \frac{1}{2}) \cap [0, \nu]$, and

$$\|h^s_P v\|_\gamma \leq C_B \|v\|_{\tilde{H}^{-s}(\gamma)}, \qquad v \in S^d_P, \tag{24}$$

for $s \in [0, \nu]$, which hold for admissible partitions $P \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$, with the constant $C_B = C_B(\sigma_\mathrm{s}, \sigma_\mathrm{g})$. Recall that $\gamma = \mathrm{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in Q} \overline{\tau}$ for some $Q \subseteq P$. The both inequalities are proved in Dahmen, Faermann, Graham, Hackbusch, and Sauter (2004) in a more general setting, with a piecewise affine mesh-size function h_P. Nevertheless, by local quasi-uniformity, their results immediately imply (23) and (24) with piecewise constant h_P, since in our setting h_P enters only in a derivative-free fashion. Finally, we will make crucial use of inequalities of the type

$$\sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{2(s+t)} \|Av\|^2_{s,\tau} \leq C_A \|v\|^2_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}, \qquad v \in S^d_P, \tag{25}$$

that is assumed to hold for admissible partitions $P \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$, with $C_A = C_A(A, \sigma_\mathrm{s}, \sigma_\mathrm{g})$. This inequality is somewhat more demanding than the standard inverse estimates since it involves the non-local operator A, and in some sense it requires A to be almost local. In fact, boundary integral operators have certain locality property, which is exploited in our analysis only through this inequality. Feischl, Karkulik, Melenk, and Praetorius (2011) announces a proof of (25) for $s = 1$, and A equal to the simple layer potential operator on a closed surface (hence $t = -\frac{1}{2}$). We prove it in Theorem 6.1 for a general class of boundary integral operators.

3 Operators of order zero

In this section, we focus on the case where the operator A is of order zero, i.e., the case $t = 0$. This is a nice model case to test our arguments on. On a practical side, this case is a representative of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on general domains or manifolds, and a model of boundary integral operators associated to the double layer potential. In the latter case, generally one only has Gårding's inequality instead of the strict coercivity (7), but we expect that such cases can be handled at the expense of requiring a sufficiently fine initial mesh, in the spirit of Mekchay and Nochetto (2005) and Gantumur (2008).

The surface Γ can be either closed or open. We employ the piecewise constants S_P^0, which we denote simply by S_P. The Galerkin approximation of u from S_P is denoted by $u_P \in S_P$, and the corresponding residual — by r_P. Recall the notations $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_\omega$ for the L^2-norms on Γ and $\omega \subset \Gamma$, respectively.

The equivalence (13) provides the convenient starting point

$$\alpha\|u-u_P\| \leq \|r_P\| \leq \beta\|u-u_P\|, \tag{26}$$

which suggests us to use local L^2-norms of the residual as error indicators. Below we prove a localized version of (26) with the error replaced by the difference between two Galerkin approximations. The simple observations in its proof are the essence of this paper, in the sense that the rest of the paper can be thought of as an attempt to exploit their natural consequences and to extend the arguments to non-zero order operators. Note that no explicit condition whatsoever is imposed on the locality of A.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $P, P' \in [P_0]$ be partitions with $P \preceq P'$, and let $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P\setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$. Then we have*

$$\alpha\|u_P-u_{P'}\| \leq \|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*} \leq \beta\|u_P-u_{P'}\| + 2\|r_P - v\|_{\Gamma^*}, \tag{27}$$

for any function $v \in S_{P'}$.

Proof. Recall the definition $P \setminus P' = \{\tau \in P : \tau \notin P'\}$, so Γ^* is the region covered by the refined triangles. Let $v = u_{P'} - u_P$, and let $v_P \in S_P$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection of v onto S_P. Then from the Galerkin condition (10) we get

$$\langle Av, v\rangle = \langle r_P, v\rangle = \langle r_P, v - v_P\rangle \leq \|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}\|v-v_P\|_{\Gamma^*} \leq \|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}\|v\|_{\Gamma^*}, \tag{28}$$

where we have used that $v = v_P$ outside Γ^*. This proves the first inequality in (27).

To prove the second inequality, let $v \in S_{P'}$ be supported in Γ^*. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|^2_{\Gamma^*} &= \langle v, v\rangle = \langle v - r_P, v\rangle + \langle A(u_{P'}-u_P), v\rangle \\ &\leq \left(\|v-r_P\|_{\Gamma^*} + \|A(u_{P'}-u_P)\|_{\Gamma^*}\right)\|v\|_{\Gamma^*}, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

implying that

$$\|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*} \leq \|r_P - v\|_{\Gamma^*} + \|v\|_{\Gamma^*} \leq 2\|r_P - v\|_{\Gamma^*} + \|A(u_{P'}-u_P)\|, \tag{30}$$

which gives the second inequality in (27). □

Remark 3.2. The arguments used in the preceding proof are of course inspired by the corresponding finite element theory. However, especially the argument (29) for the lower bound seems to have a new flavour, in that it does not break the action of A up into element-wise (or star-wise) operations, making it particularly suitable for nonlocal operators.

We recognize the term $\|r_P - v\|_{\Gamma^*}$ in (27) as an oscillation term, which measures how much of the residual is captured when we move from P to P'. It is of interest to control this term. Since $S_P \subset H^r(\Gamma)$ for $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, *assuming* that $A : H^r(\Gamma) \to H^r(\Gamma)$ is bounded for all $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have $Au_P \in H^r(\Gamma)$ for r in the same range. Now, *assuming* that $f \in H^r(\Gamma, P_0)$ for some $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, this ensures $r_P \in H^r(\Gamma, P_0)$, therefore from (19) we have

$$\inf_{v \in S_{P'}} \|r_P - v\|^2_{\Gamma^*} \leq C_J^2 \sum_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} h_\tau^{2r} |r_P|^2_{r,\tau}. \tag{31}$$

This suggests us to define the *residual oscillation*

$$\operatorname{osc}(v, P, \omega) := \left(\sum_{\tau \in P,\, \tau \subset \omega} h_\tau^{2r} |f - Av|^2_{r,\tau} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{32}$$

for $\omega \subseteq \Gamma$ and $v \in S_P$, so that (27) implies

$$\alpha \|u_P - u_{P'}\| \leq \|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*} \leq \beta \|u_P - u_{P'}\| + 2C_J \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P, \Gamma^*). \tag{33}$$

If the oscillation term is sufficiently small, the difference between two discrete solutions is completely controlled by a local L^2-norm of the residual. In this sense, the first inequality in (33) is an example of a *local discrete upper bound*, while the second one is that of a *local discrete lower bound*. These bounds are also called *local discrete reliability* and *local discrete efficiency*, respectively.

Remark 3.3 (Non-residual estimators and the saturation assumption). Following the wisdom from finite element theory, in this section we will exploit the bounds (33) by designing an adaptive algorithm that refines the triangles where the quantity $\|r_P\|_\tau + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P, \tau)$ is large. Before delving into this let us remark that there exist non-residual type estimators that have some advantage over the residual based estimators. For these estimators, usually only the global lower bound is justified, and the global upper bound depends on the *saturation assumption*. The latter is the assumption that $|||u - \hat{u}_P||| \leq \alpha |||u - u_P|||$ for some constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, where $\hat{u}_P$ is the Galerkin approximation from some enriched space $\hat{S}_P \supset S_P$, which is typically the piecewise constants on a uniform refinement of P, or piecewise linears on P. Note that by Galerkin orthogonality, this assumption is equivalent to $|||\hat{u}_P - u_P|||^2 \geq (1 - \alpha^2) |||u - u_P|||^2$. It is possible to extract some information from Lemma 3.1 on these issues. For instance, the discrete lower bound in (33), combined with the upper bound in (26) gives the second inequality in

$$|||u_P - u_{P'}||| \leq |||u - u_P||| \leq \bar{\beta} |||u_P - u_{P'}||| + 2C_J \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P, \Gamma), \tag{34}$$

while the first inequality follows from the Galerkin orthogonality, where $\bar{\beta} > 0$ is a constant. Taking P' to be the uniform refinement of P, this gives global lower and upper bounds for the $h - h/2$ estimator $\|u_P - u_{P'}\|$, and moreover justifies the saturation assumption up to an oscillation term. Local bounds for non-residual estimators remain as an important open problem.

In the following, we will *fix* some $r \in (0, 1]$, and assume[1] that $f \in H^r(\Gamma, P_0)$. Note that this is in the same spirit as assuming $f \in L^2$ in the context of second order elliptic equations, even though there the weak formulation is well-posed for $f \in H^{-1}$. We will use the convenient abbreviation $\operatorname{osc}(P, \omega) = \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P, \omega)$. The next lemma collects crucial properties of the oscillation $\operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)$ and the combination $\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2$, *assuming* an inverse-type inequality, which shall be verified in §6. As it turns out, this inverse-type inequality is also sufficient to guarantee the finiteness of oscillation (32). The quantity $\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2$, the counterpart of the *total error* in Cascon, Kreuzer, Nochetto, and Siebert (2008), will be the main character in our subsequent analysis.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that*

$$\sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{2r} |Av|_{r,\tau}^2 \leq C_A \|v\|^2, \qquad v \in S_P, \tag{35}$$

for $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, with the constant $C_A = C_A(A, \sigma_s, \sigma_g)$. Then the oscillation (32) is finite for any $v \in S_P$ and $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$. Moreover, the followings hold.

a) There is a constant $C_G > 0$ such that

$$\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P, \Gamma)^2 \leq C_G \inf_{v \in S_P} \left(\|u - v\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(v, P, \Gamma)^2 \right), \tag{36}$$

for any $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$.

b) There exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma)^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 - \lambda(1 + \delta)\operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2 + C_\delta \|u_P - u_{P'}\|^2, \tag{37}$$

for any $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ with $P \preceq P'$, and for any $\delta > 0$, with C_δ depending on δ, where $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$.

c) Let $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ be such that $P \preceq P'$, and let $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P' \setminus P} \overline{\tau}$. If, for some $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ it holds that

$$\|u - u_{P'}\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma)^2 \leq \mu \left(\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \right), \tag{38}$$

then with $\theta = \frac{\alpha^3(1-2\mu)}{\beta^3(1+2C_A)}$, we have

$$\|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2 \geq \theta \left(\|r_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \right). \tag{39}$$

---

[1] In view of (32), one has a computational advantage if $r = 1$, since there would be no fractional norms.

Remark 3.5. The estimate (35) is proved in Section 6 for a general class of singular integral operators of order zero, under the hypothesis that $\hat{A} : H^\sigma(\Omega) \to H^\sigma(\Omega)$ is bounded for some $\sigma > \frac{n}{2}$ and that $r \in (0, \sigma)$, where $\hat{A}$ is an extension of A to Ω if Γ is open, and $\hat{A} = A$ if $\Gamma = \Omega$. Recalling that Ω is a $C^{\nu-1,1}$-manifold, the condition on σ translates to $\nu > \frac{n}{2}$, see Remark 6.3 for details. Therefore Lipschitz curves are allowed, but for $n = 2$ we need a $C^{1,1}$ surface. Note that there is no condition on the regularity of the boundary of Γ other than the Lipschitz condition, when Γ is an open surface. In any case, we believe that the restriction $\nu > \frac{n}{2}$ is an artifact of our proof, and anticipating future weakenings of this restriction, the rest of this section will be presented so that it depends only on the assumption (35).

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Let $w \in S_P$ satisfy

$$\|u - w\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(w, P, \Gamma)^2 \leq 2 \inf_{v \in S_P} \left(\|u - v\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(v, P, \Gamma)^2 \right). \tag{40}$$

Then from the definition of oscillation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P, \Gamma)^2 &\leq 2 \sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{2r} |f - Aw|_{r,\tau}^2 + 2 \sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{2r} |A(w - u_P)|_{r,\tau}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \operatorname{osc}(w, P, \Gamma)^2 + 2C_A \|w - u_P\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where in the last step we have used inverse inequality (35). This gives

$$\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P, \Gamma)^2 \leq \|u - u_P\|^2 + 2C_A \|w - u_P\|^2 + 2 \operatorname{osc}(w, P, \Gamma)^2, \tag{42}$$

and upon using the Galerkin orthogonality $\|u - u_P\|^2 + \|w - u_P\|^2 = \|u - w\|^2$, we obtain (36) with, say $C_G = 4(1 + C_A)$.

Now we turn to b). With $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1)$ being the contraction factor for h_τ when τ is refined once, we have

$$\sum_{\tau \in P' \setminus P} h_\tau^{2r} |r_P|_{r,\tau}^2 \leq \sum_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \lambda_0^{2r} h_\tau^{2r} |r_P|_{r,\tau}^2 = \lambda_0^{2r} \operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma^*)^2. \tag{43}$$

Using this in

$$\operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma)^2 \leq (1 + \delta) \sum_{\tau \in P'} h_\tau^{2r} |r_P|_{r,\tau}^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\delta}) \sum_{\tau \in P'} h_\tau^{2r} |A(u_{P'} - u_P)|_{r,\tau}^2, \tag{44}$$

and by using the inverse inequality (35) on the last term, we establish (37).

For c), from (38) we infer

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2\mu)(\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2) &\leq \|u_P - u_{P'}\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 - 2 \operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma)^2 \\ &\leq (1 + 2C_A) \|u_P - u_{P'}\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\beta(1 + 2C_A)}{\alpha^2} \|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*} + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where we have used the Galerkin orthogonality, the estimate

$$\operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma \setminus \Gamma^*)^2 \leq 2 \operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma \setminus \Gamma^*)^2 + 2C_A |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2, \tag{46}$$

the local discrete upper bound in (33), and the norm equivalence (8). The proof is completed upon noting that

$$\|r_P\|^2 \leq \gamma |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2, \tag{47}$$

where $\gamma = \beta^2/\alpha \geq 1$, which is a combination of the global lower bound in (13), and the norm equivalence (8). □

Once we have the preceding results, and given the techniques developed in Stevenson (2007) and Cascon et al. (2008), it is a fairly straightforward matter to obtain geometric error reduction and quasi-optimality for an adaptive method such as the ones considered here. Nevertheless, we include detailed proofs for convenience of the reader. Our first stop is the contraction property of the adaptive method.

Proposition 3.6. *Let the assumption* (35) *of Lemma 3.4 hold. Let* $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ *be admissible partitions with* $P \preceq P'$*, and let* $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$*. Suppose, for some* $\theta \in (0, 1]$ *that*

$$\|r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2 \geq \theta \left(\|r_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \right). \tag{48}$$

Then there exist constants $\gamma \geq 0$ *and* $\mu \in (0, 1)$ *such that*

$$|\!|\!| u - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma)^2 \leq \mu \left(|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \right). \tag{49}$$

Proof. The property (48), together with the global upper bound in (13), the local discrete lower bound in (33), and the norm equivalence (8), gives

$$\theta \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{\beta} |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \right) \leq \frac{2\beta^2}{\alpha} |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + 2(2C_J + 1)^2 \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2. \tag{50}$$

Then for any $\gamma \geq 0$, we combine Lemma 3.4 b) and (50) to infer

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\!|\!| u - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma)^2 = |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 - |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \operatorname{osc}(P', \Gamma)^2 \\
&\quad \leq |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 - (1 - \gamma C_\delta) |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma(1+\delta) \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 - \gamma\lambda(1+\delta) \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2 \\
&\qquad \leq \left(1 - \frac{\theta \alpha^3 (1 - \gamma C_\delta)}{2\beta^2} \right) |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \left(\gamma(1+\delta) - \frac{\theta \alpha (1 - \gamma C_\delta)}{2\beta^2} \right) \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \\
&\qquad\qquad + \left(\frac{\alpha (2C_J + 1)^2 (1 - \gamma C_\delta)}{\beta^2} - \gamma\lambda(1+\delta) \right) \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2 \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad =: \mu_1 |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \mu_2 \gamma \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 + \mu_3 \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

We choose γ, depending on $\delta > 0$, so that $\mu_3 = 0$, i.e., so that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = C_\delta + \frac{\lambda\beta^2(1+\delta)}{\alpha(2C_J+1)^2}. \tag{52}$$

With this choice and for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\mu_1 = 1 - \frac{\alpha^2\gamma\lambda\theta(1+\delta)}{2(2C_J+1)^2} < 1, \tag{53}$$

and

$$\mu_2 = (1+\delta)\left(1 - \frac{\lambda\theta}{2(2C_J+1)^2}\right) < 1, \tag{54}$$

establishing the proof. $\square$

To be explicit, the importance of the preceding proposition is the following. Suppose that we have an admissible partition P and the discrete solution $u_P \in S_P$. Then the local residual norm $\|r_P\|_\tau$ and the local oscillation $\operatorname{osc}(P,\tau)$ are computable for $\tau \in P$, and by selecting a set $R \subset P$ of triangles such that $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int}\bigcup_{\tau\in R}\overline{\tau}$ satisfies (48) for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, and then by finding an admissible refinement P' of P such that $P \setminus P' \supseteq R$, i.e., that each triangle in R is refined at least once, we can guarantee $e(P') \leq \mu e(P)$ for some $\mu < 1$, where $e(Q) = |||u - u_Q|||^2 + \gamma \operatorname{osc}(Q,\Gamma)^2$. By repeatedly applying this procedure, we can ensure convergence $|||u - u_P||| \to 0$ as P runs over the partitions generated by the algorithm. This however, does not say anything about the growth of $\#P$, a fundamental question that will be addressed below.

For $u \in L^2(\Gamma)$ the solution of $Au = f$ with $f \in H^r(\Gamma, P_0)$, and for $P \in [P_0]$, we define

$$\operatorname{dist}_r(u, S_P) = \min_{v\in S_P}\left(|||u - v|||^2 + \operatorname{osc}(v,P,\Gamma)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{55}$$

where the implicit dependence of oscillation on r has been made explicit. Note that the minimum exists since S_P is finite dimensional. Furthermore, for $\varepsilon > 0$ we define

$$\operatorname{card}_r(u,\varepsilon) = \min\{\#P - \#P_0 : P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0),\ \operatorname{dist}_r(u,S_P) \leq \varepsilon\}. \tag{56}$$

Hence $\operatorname{card}_r(u,\varepsilon)$ is in certain sense the cardinality of a smallest admissible partition P that is able to support a function that is within an ε distance from u. Note that $\operatorname{card}_r(u,\varepsilon)$ is finite for any $\varepsilon > 0$, since from the discussion in the preceding paragraph, there is a sequence of (finite) partitions $\{P_k\} \subset \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ with $\operatorname{dist}_r(u, S_{P_k}) \to 0$.

Another notion we need is that of *overlay* of partitions: We assume that there is an operation $\oplus : \operatorname{adm}(P_0) \times \operatorname{adm}(P_0) \to \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ satisfying

$$P \oplus Q \succeq P, \qquad P \oplus Q \succeq Q, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \#(P \oplus Q) \leq \#P + \#Q - \#P_0, \tag{57}$$

for $P, Q \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$. In the conforming world, $P \oplus Q$ is taken to be the smallest and common conforming refinement of P and Q, for which (57) is justified in Cascon et al. (2008).

The following proposition shows an optimal way to select the triangles to be refined. The procedure is known as *Dörfler's marking strategy* in literature.

Proposition 3.7. *Let the assumption (35) of Lemma 3.4 hold. Let $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, and let $\theta \in (0, \theta^*)$ with $\theta^* = \frac{\alpha^3}{\beta^3(1+2C_A)}$. Suppose that $R \subseteq P$ is a subset whose cardinality is minimal up to a constant factor $\kappa \geq 1$, among all $R \subseteq P$ satisfying*

$$\|r_P\|^2_{\Gamma^*(R)} + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*(R))^2 \geq \theta \left(\|r_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2\right). \tag{58}$$

where $\Gamma^*(R) = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in R} \overline{\tau}$. Then we have

$$\# R \leq \kappa \operatorname{card}_r(u, \varepsilon), \tag{59}$$

where ε is defined by

$$\varepsilon^2 = \frac{\theta^* - \theta}{2C_G\theta^*} \left(\interleave u - u_P \interleave^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2\right). \tag{60}$$

Proof. Let us introduce the abbreviation

$$e(Q) = \interleave u - u_Q \interleave^2 + \operatorname{osc}(Q, \Gamma)^2, \qquad Q \in [P_0], \tag{61}$$

and let $P_\varepsilon \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ be such that

$$\# P_\varepsilon - \# P_0 \leq \operatorname{card}_r(u, \varepsilon), \qquad \text{and} \qquad e(P_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^2. \tag{62}$$

Then for $\tilde{P} = P \oplus P_\varepsilon$, from Lemma 3.4 a) we have

$$e(\tilde{P}) \leq C_G e(P_\varepsilon) \leq C_G \varepsilon^2 = \mu e(P), \tag{63}$$

where $\mu = \frac{\theta^* - \theta}{2\theta^*} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and so an application of Lemma 3.4 c) gives

$$\|r_P\|^2_{\Gamma^*(P \setminus \tilde{P})} + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma^*(P \setminus \tilde{P}))^2 \geq \theta \left(\|r_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2\right). \tag{64}$$

Recalling that R minimizes $\# R$ up to the constant factor κ among all subsets $P \setminus \tilde{P}$ satisfying the preceding inequality, we infer that $\# R \leq \kappa \, \#(P \setminus \tilde{P})$, and taking into account that $\#(P \setminus \tilde{P}) \leq \# \tilde{P} - \# P$ and the estimate in (57), we get

$$\# R \leq \kappa(\# \tilde{P} - \# P) \leq \kappa(\# P_\varepsilon - \# P_0) \leq \kappa \operatorname{card}_r(u, \varepsilon), \tag{65}$$

completing the proof. □

We have almost all the ingredients to give a bound on the growth of $\#P$, and to discuss whether this growth rate is optimal in one or another sense. Let us start by making the term “adaptive BEM” precise.

Algorithm 1: Adaptive BEM ($t = 0$)

```
   parameters: conforming partition $P_0$, and $\theta \in [0,1]$
   output    : $P_k \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$ and $u_k \in S_{P_k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$
1  for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ do
2      Compute $u_k \in S_{P_k}$ as the Galerkin approximation of $u$ from $S_{P_k}$;
3      Identify a minimal (up to a constant factor) set $R_k \subset P_k$ of triangles satisfying
           $\|r_k\|^2_{\Gamma^*} + \mathrm{osc}(P_k, \Gamma^*)^2 \geq \theta \left( \|r_k\|^2 + \mathrm{osc}(P_k, \Gamma)^2 \right),$    (66)
       where $r_k = f - Au_k$ and $\Gamma^* = \mathrm{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in R_k} \overline{\tau}$;
4      Set $P_{k+1}$ as an admissible refinement of $P_k$ with $P_k \setminus P_{k+1} \supseteq R_k$;
5  endfor
```

In order to make Line 4 in this algorithm unambiguous, we assume that a procedure to compute $P_{k+1} \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$ from P_k and R_k is specified, and that this procedure satisfies

$$\#P_k - \#P_0 \leq C_c \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \#R_m, \qquad k \geq 1, \tag{67}$$

for any given sequence $\{R_m\}$ subject to the obvious constraint $R_m \subset P_m$, where $C_c > 0$ is a constant. This assumption is justified for newest vertex bisection algorithm in Binev et al. (2004); Stevenson (2008), and moreover, can be demonstrated for the red refinement procedure by adapting their techniques.

Now we turn to the issue of convergence rate. Since Proposition 3.7 gives a bound on $\#R_k$, we simply need to use (67) to get

$$\#P_k - \#P_0 \leq \kappa C_c \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \mathrm{card}_r(u, Ce(P_m)), \tag{68}$$

where C is the constant from (60), and $e(P_m)$ is as in (61). On the other hand, Proposition 3.6 guarantees a geometric decrease of $e(P_m)$, i.e, we have

$$e(P_k) \leq C\mu^{k-m} e(P_m), \qquad \text{hence} \qquad \mathrm{card}_r(u, Ce(P_m)) \leq \mathrm{card}_r(u, C\mu^{m-k} e(P_k)), \tag{69}$$

for some constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \mu < 1$. Note that C denotes different constants in its different appearances. Therefore, if our particular $u \in A^{-1}(H^r(\Gamma, P_0))$ satisfies

$$\mathrm{card}_r(u, \lambda\varepsilon) \leq C\lambda^{-1/s} \mathrm{card}_r(u, \varepsilon), \qquad \lambda > 1,\ \varepsilon > 0, \tag{70}$$

for some constant $s > 0$, then we would get what can be called *instance optimality*

$$\#P_k - \#P_0 \leq C\mathrm{card}_r(u, e(P_k)). \tag{71}$$

However, it is not clear how to usefully characterize the set of such u, so we settle for something more modest. Instead of (70), if we have

$$\mathrm{card}_r(u, \varepsilon) \leq C_u \varepsilon^{-1/s}, \qquad \varepsilon > 0, \tag{72}$$

for some constant $s > 0$, then we get what can be called *class optimality*

$$\#P_k - \#P_0 \leq CC_u e(P_k)^{-1/s}. \tag{73}$$

This motivates us to define the *approximation class* $\mathcal{A}_{r,s} \subset A^{-1}(H^r(\Gamma, P_0))$ with $s \geq 0$ to be the set of u for which

$$|u|_{\mathcal{A}_{r,s}} = \sup_{\varepsilon>0} (\mathrm{card}_r(u, \varepsilon)^s \varepsilon) < \infty. \tag{74}$$

Thus $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ is characterized by

$$\mathrm{card}_r(u, \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^{-1/s} |u|_{\mathcal{A}_{r,s}}, \tag{75}$$

or equivalently, by

$$\min\{\mathrm{dist}_r(u, S_P) : P \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0),\, \#P - \#P_0 \leq N\} \leq N^{-s} |u|_{\mathcal{A}_{r,s}}. \tag{76}$$

We have proved the following.

Theorem 3.8. *Let the assumption* (35) *of Lemma 3.4 hold, and in Algorithm 1, suppose that* $\theta \in (0, \theta^*)$ *with* $\theta^* = \frac{\alpha^3}{\beta^3(1+2C_A)}$. *Let* $f \in H^r(\Gamma, P_0)$ *and* $u \in \mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ *for some* $s > 0$. *Then we have*

$$|||u - u_k|||^2 + \mathrm{osc}(u_k, P_k, \Gamma)^2 \leq C|u|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{r,s}} (\#P_k - \#P_0)^{-2s}, \tag{77}$$

where $C > 0$ *is a constant.*

Remark 3.9 (Approximation classes). The preceding theorem establishes optimal convergence rates for our adaptive BEM with respect to the class $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$. However, this approximation class is based on a modified notion of error (55) that has the oscillation term in it, while what is really relevant is the class $\mathcal{A}_s$ that is based on $\mathrm{dist}(u, S_P) = \inf_{v \in S_P} |||u - v|||$. Note that if $r = 0$, then the oscillation is dominated by the error, so $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{A}_{0,s}$ with equivalent (quasi-) norms. As far as the author is aware, the idea of a modified approximation class for adaptive methods first appeared in Cascon et al. (2008). This is an important idea as it allows for breaking up the optimality problem into two natural parts: first to establish optimality in some approximation class that is naturally tied to the particular algorithm, and then to show that those classes are sufficiently large so as to contain the corresponding standard approximation classes. The approximation class $\mathbb{A}_s$ proposed by Cascon et al. (2008) can be adapted to our setting as the class of triplets (u, f, A) satisfying $u \in \mathcal{A}_{r,s}$, $f = Au \in H^r(\Gamma, P_0)$, and A varying in some predetermined class of boundary integral operators. There seem to be some convenience in using classes of singletons u, rather than triplets (u, f, A). First of all, f is redundant since f can be deduced from $f = Au$. More importantly, we want the approximation classes to be linear spaces as opposed to nonlinear sets of triplets (u, f, A) or pairs (u, A). Put differently, we view the nonlinear space $\mathbb{A}_s$ as a collection of linear spaces parameterized by A. Then we propose the problem of characterizing $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ on a large relevant class of A, which is a more tractable problem than giving a complete characterization of $\mathbb{A}_s$.

4 Positive order operators

In this section, we consider the case $t \in [0, \frac{3}{4})$. We assume that Γ is open, and remark that the closed case can be treated with similar methods. Recall that the equation we are dealing with is $Au = f$ with linear homeomorphism $A : \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma) \to H^{-t}(\Gamma)$. For simplicity we consider right hand sides satisfying $f \in L^2(\Gamma)$. We employ the continuous piecewise affine functions with homogeneous boundary conditions $S_P := \tilde{S}^1_P$. The admissible partitions will be used synonymous with conforming triangulations, with the newest vertex bisection algorithm for refinements. So we have $S_P \subset \tilde{H}^{2t}(\Gamma)$, and we make an additional assumption that $A : \tilde{H}^{2t}(\Gamma) \to L^2(\Gamma)$ is bounded, in order to keep the useful property $f - Av \in L^2(\Gamma)$ for any finite element function $v \in S_P$. Note that this assumption is satisfied for our main example – the hypersingular integral operator. Note also that if $t > \frac{1}{2}$ then we need $\nu \geq 2$, i.e., we need the space Ω in which Γ lies to be at least a $C^{1,1}$ manifold.

Starting from this section, we shall often dispense with giving explicit names to constants, and use the Vinogradov-style notation $X \lesssim Y$, which means $X \leq C \cdot Y$ with some constant C that is allowed to depend only on the operator A and on (geometry of) the set of admissible partitions $\operatorname{adm}(P_0)$. The following is an extension of Lemma 3.1 to $t \geq 0$ and piecewise linear finite element spaces. In contrast to Lemma 3.1, note that ω^* includes a buffer layer of triangles around the refined triangles, so that $\omega^* = \omega(\Gamma^*)$ with Γ^* as in Lemma 3.1. By using the Scott-Zhang quasi-interpolation operator in the proof, it is possible to do without the buffer layer if $t > \frac{1}{2}$, which is however not terribly exciting since the relevant case to us is $t = \frac{1}{2}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ with $P \preceq P'$, and let $\omega^* = \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \omega(\tau)$. Then we have*

$$\|u_P - u_{P'}\| \lesssim \|h_P^t r_P\|_{\omega^*} \lesssim \|h_P/h_{P'}\|_\infty^t \|u_P - u_{P'}\| + \|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} v\|_{\omega^*}, \tag{78}$$

for any $v \in S_{P'}$ with $\operatorname{supp} v \subseteq \overline{\omega^*}$, where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the L^∞-norm. Moreover, we have the following global bounds

$$\|u - u_P\| \lesssim \|h_P^t r_P\| \lesssim \|h_P/h_{P'}\|_\infty^t \|u - u_P\| + \|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} v\|, \tag{79}$$

for any $v \in S_{P'}$.

Remark 4.2. The global upper bound (i.e., the first inequality) of (79) has been established in Carstensen, Maischak, Praetorius, and Stephan (2004), and a similar bound involving local L^p-norms on stars appears in Nochetto, von Petersdorff, and Zhang (2010).

Proof of Lemma 4.1. For $v \in \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)$ and $v_P = Q_P v \in S_P$ being the quasi-interpolant of v as in (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle r_P, v\rangle &= \langle r_P, v - v_P\rangle = \langle h_P^t r_P, h_P^{-t}(v - v_P)\rangle \\ &\leq \|h_P^t r_P\| \|h_P^{-t}(v - v_P)\| \lesssim \|h_P^t r_P\| \|v\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)},\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

where in the last step we have used

$$\sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{-2t} \|v - v_P\|_\tau^2 \lesssim \sum_{\tau \in P} \|v\|^2_{H^t(\omega(\tau))} \lesssim \|v\|^2_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}, \tag{81}$$

by local finiteness. This gives the first inequality in (79).

With $v = u_{P'} - u_P$ and $v_P = Q_P v \in S_P$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Av, v\rangle &= \langle r_P, v - v_P\rangle = \langle r_P, v - v_P\rangle_{\omega^*} \\ &\leq \|h_P^t r_P\|_{\omega^*} \|h_P^{-t}(v - v_P)\|_{\omega^*} \lesssim \|h_P^t r_P\|_{\omega^*} \|v\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)},\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

where we have used the fact that $v_P = v$ outside ω^*. This gives the first inequality in (78).

Let either $e = u_{P'} - u_P$ or $e = u - u_P$. Then in both cases, for $v \in S_{P'}$ and $\omega \supseteq \operatorname{supp} v$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle h_P^{-t} v, h_P^{-t} v\rangle_\omega &= \langle h_P^{-2t} v, v\rangle = \langle h_P^{-2t} v - r_P, v\rangle + \langle Ae, v\rangle \\ &= \langle h_P^{-t} v - h_P^t r_P, h_P^{-t} v\rangle + \langle Ae, v\rangle \\ &\leq \|h_P^{-t} v - h_P^t r_P\|_\omega \|h_P^{-t} v\|_\omega + \|Ae\|_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)} \|v\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)} \\ &\lesssim \|h_P^{-t} v - h_P^t r_P\|_\omega \|h_P^{-t} v\|_\omega + \|Ae\|_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)} \|h_{P'}^{-t} v\|_\omega,\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

so that

$$\|h_P^{-t} v\|_\omega \lesssim \|h_P^{-t} v - h_P^t r_P\|_\omega + \|h_P / h_{P'}\|_\infty^t \|e\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}. \tag{84}$$

From this, we infer

$$\|h_P^t r_P\|_\omega \leq \|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} v\|_\omega + \|h_P^{-t} v\|_\omega \lesssim \|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} v\|_\omega + \|h_P / h_{P'}\|_\infty^t \|e\|_{\tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)}, \tag{85}$$

proving the both second inequalities in (78) and (79). □

Remark 4.3 (Operators of order zero). The preceding result has important implications also in the case $t = 0$. Assuming that $f \in H^1(\Gamma, P_0)$, we can define the oscillation

$$\operatorname{osc}(P, \omega) = \left(\sum_{\tau \in P,\, \tau \subset \omega} h_\tau^2 |r_P|_{1,\tau}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{86}$$

for $\omega \subseteq \Gamma$, so that (78) and (79) imply

$$|||u_P - u_{P'}||| \lesssim \|r_P\|_{\omega^*} \lesssim |||u_P - u_{P'}||| + \operatorname{osc}(P, \omega^*). \tag{87}$$

and

$$|||u - u_P||| \lesssim \|r_P\| \lesssim |||u - u_P||| + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma). \tag{88}$$

Then the techniques from Section 3 can be adapted to obtain a quasi-optimal convergence rate in this setting as well. The only new features are the oscillation term in the global upper bound, and the buffer layer of triangles in ω^* as compared to Γ^*.

Remark 4.4 (Saturation assumption). For a large number of non-residual *a posteriori* error estimators for the hypersingular integral equation on curves, Erath, Funken, Goldenits, and Praetorius (2009b) proved that the estimators are equivalent to the global error, with the upper bound depending on the saturation assumption: $|||u - u_P||| \lesssim |||\hat{u}_P - u_P|||$, where $\hat{u}_P$ is the Galerkin approximation from some enriched space $\hat{S}_P \supset S_P$, which is typically the piecewise linears on the uniform refinement of P. Combining the discrete lower bound with the global upper bound from Lemma 4.1, we have

$$|||u - u_P||| \lesssim |||u_P - u_{P'}||| + \|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} v\|, \tag{89}$$

for any $v \in S_{P'}$, where P' is the uniform refinement of P. This confirms the saturation assumption up to an oscillation term. Then adapting the techniques from Ferraz-Leite, Ortner, and Praetorius (2010), one can expect to get a geometric error reduction for adaptive algorithms based on non-residual type estimators; however, it seems that any type of quasi-optimality result would require new ideas.

Let us get back to the case $t > 0$ and the residual based error indicators $\|h_\tau^t r_P\|_\tau$ from Lemma 4.1. We define the oscillation for $v \in S_P$ by

$$\operatorname{osc}(v, P) = \|h_P^t (f - Av) - h_P^{-t} w\|, \tag{90}$$

where, with $\hat{P}$ the uniform refinement of P, $w = Q_{\hat{P}} h_P^{2t}(f - Av) \in S_{\hat{P}}$ is the Clément interpolator of $h_P^{2t}(f - Av)$, given by

$$Q_{\hat{P}} g = \sum_{z \in N_{\hat{P}} \setminus \partial\Gamma} g_z(z) \phi_z, \tag{91}$$

where $N_{\hat{P}}$ is the set of all nodes in $\hat{P}$, $\phi_z \in S_{\hat{P}}$ is the standard nodal basis function at z, and $g_z \in \mathbb{P}_1$ is the L^2-orthogonal projection of g onto the affine functions on the star $\hat{\omega}(z)$ around z with respect to $\hat{P}$. Then for $\gamma \subseteq \Gamma$ and $\hat{\omega}(\gamma) = \bigcup\{\hat{\omega}(z) : z \in N_{\hat{P}} \cap \overline{\gamma}\}$, we have

$$\|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} Q_{\hat{P}} h_P^{2t} r_P\|_\gamma^2 \leq C_Q \|h_P^t r_P\|_{\hat{\omega}(\gamma)}^2, \tag{92}$$

for some constant $C_Q > 0$, i.e., the estimator dominates the oscillation on the Galerkin solutions. In particular, we have the equivalence

$$\alpha_1 \|h_P^t r_P\|^2 \leq \|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 \lesssim \|h_P^t r_P\|^2, \tag{93}$$

where $\alpha_1 > 0$ is a contstant. Hence the situation is very similar to what happens in the finite element case, and in particular, the local quantities $\|h_P^t r_P\|_\tau$ as error indicators will give rise to an adaptive algorithm that converges quasi-optimally in a certain sense.

Lemma 4.5. *Assume that*

$$\|h_P^t A v\|^2 \leq C_A \|v\|^2, \qquad v \in S_P, \tag{94}$$

for $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, with the constant $C_A = C_A(A, \sigma_s, \sigma_g)$. Then the followings hold.

a) There is a constant $C_G > 0$ such that

$$\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 \leq C_G \inf_{v \in S_P} \left(\|u - v\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(v, P)^2 \right), \tag{95}$$

for any $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$.

b) There exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\|h_{P'}^t r_{P'}\|^2 \leq (1+\delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|^2 - \lambda(1+\delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}^2 + C_\delta \|u_P - u_{P'}\|^2, \tag{96}$$

for any $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ with $P \preceq P'$, and for any $\delta > 0$, with C_δ depending on δ, where $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$.

c) Let $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ be such that $P \preceq P'$, and let $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$. If, for some $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ it holds that

$$\|u - u_{P'}\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_{P'}, P')^2 \leq \mu \left(\|u - u_P\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 \right), \tag{97}$$

then with $\theta = \frac{\alpha_1(1-2\mu)}{C_Q + \beta_1(1+2C_A C_Q)}$ and $\omega^* = \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \omega(\tau)$, we have

$$\|h_P^t r_P\|_{\omega^*}^2 \geq \theta \|h_P^t r_P\|^2, \tag{98}$$

where $\beta_1 > 0$ is a constant implicit in the local discrete upper bound in (78), such that $\|u_P - u_{P'}\|^2 \leq \beta_1 \|h_P^t r_P\|_{\omega^*}^2$.

Remark 4.6. The estimate (94) is proved in Section 6 for a general class of singular integral operators of positive order, under the hypothesis that $\hat{A} : H^{t+\sigma}(\Omega) \to H^{-t+\sigma}(\Omega)$ is bounded for some $\sigma > \max\{\frac{n}{2}, t\}$, where $\hat{A}$ is an extension of A to Ω. Recalling that Ω is a $C^{\nu-1,1}$-manifold, and assuming that $t \leq \frac{n}{2}$, the condition on σ translates to $\nu > \frac{n}{2} + t$, see Remark 6.3 for details. Therefore for $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ we need a $C^{1,1}$ curve or a surface, respectively, assuming that $\frac{1}{2} \leq t < 1$. Note that the boundary of Γ is allowed to be Lipschitz. Anticipating future developments on (94), the rest of this section is presented so as to depend only on the assumption (94).

Proof of Lemma 4.5. For $v \in S_P$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{osc}(u_P, P) &= \|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} Q_{\hat{P}} h_P^{2t} r_P\| \\ &\leq \operatorname{osc}(v, P) + \|h_P^t A(v - u_P) - h_P^{-t} Q_{\hat{P}} h_P^{2t} A(v - u_P)\| \\ &\leq \operatorname{osc}(v, P) + C_Q^{1/2} \|h_P^t A(v - u_P)\| \leq \operatorname{osc}(v, P) + C_Q^{1/2} C_A^{1/2} |\!|\!| v - u_P |\!|\!|.\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

With this estimate at hand, part a) of the lemma can be proven in exactly the same way as Lemma 3.4 a).

Part b) follows from

$$\|h_{P'}^t r_{P'}\|^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|h_{P'}^t r_P\|^2 + C_A(1 + \delta^{-1}) |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2, \tag{100}$$

and the fact that $h_{P'} \leq \lambda_0 h_P$ on Γ^* for some constant $\lambda_0 < 1$.

For c), the global lower bound, property (97), and the Galerkin orthogonality give

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1(1 - 2\mu)\|h_P^t r_P\|^2 &\leq (1 - 2\mu)\left(|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 \right) \\ &\leq |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 - 2 |\!|\!| u - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 - 2\operatorname{osc}(u_{P'}, P')^2 \\ &\leq |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 - 2\operatorname{osc}(u_{P'}, P')^2.\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

For $\tau \in \hat{P} \cap \hat{P}'$ with all its neighbors also in $\hat{P} \cap \hat{P}'$, where $\hat{P}'$ is the uniform refinement of P', we have $(Q_{\hat{P}} v)|_\tau = (Q_{\hat{P}'} v)|_\tau$, and also $h_P = h_{P'}$ there. Hence, with $\hat{\omega} = \bigcup\{\tau \in \hat{P} : \exists \sigma \in P \setminus P', \overline{\tau} \cap \overline{\sigma} \neq \varnothing\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|h_P^t r_P - h_P^{-t} Q_{\hat{P}} h_P^{2t} r_P\|_{\Gamma \setminus \hat{\omega}} &\leq \|h_{P'}^t r_P - h_{P'}^{-t} Q_{\hat{P}'} h_{P'}^{2t} r_P\| \\ &\leq \|h_{P'}^t r_{P'} - h_{P'}^{-t} Q_{\hat{P}'} h_{P'}^{2t} r_{P'}\| + \|h_{P'}^t A(u_P - u_{P'}) - h_{P'}^{-t} Q_{\hat{P}} h_{P'}^{2t} A(u_P - u_{P'})\| \\ &\leq \operatorname{osc}(u_{P'}, P') + C_Q^{1/2} \|h_{P'}^t A(u_P - u_{P'})\|.\end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

Combining this with (92), we infer

$$\operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 \leq 2\operatorname{osc}(u_{P'}, P')^2 + C_Q \|h_P^t r_P\|_{\omega^*}^2 + 2C_Q C_A |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2, \tag{103}$$

which, then on account of (101) and the local discrete upper bound, proves the claim. □

Now we prove an analogue of Proposition 3.6 on error reduction.

Proposition 4.7. *Let the assumption* (94) *of Lemma 4.5 hold. Let* $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ *be with* $P \preceq P'$*, and let* $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$*. Suppose, for some* $\vartheta \in (0,1)$ *that*

$$\|h_P^t r_P\|_{\Gamma^*} \geq \vartheta \|h_P^t r_P\|. \tag{104}$$

Then there exist constants $\gamma \geq 0$ *and* $\mu \in (0,1)$ *such that*

$$|\!|\!| u - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \|h_{P'}^t r_{P'}\|^2 \leq \mu \left(|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \|h_P^t r_P\|^2 \right). \tag{105}$$

Proof. From the Galerkin orthogonality and Lemma 4.5 b) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\!|\!| u - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \|h_{P'}^t r_{P'}\|^2 &= |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 - |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \|h_{P'}^t r_{P'}\|^2 \\
&\leq |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma(1+\delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|^2 - \gamma\lambda(1+\delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}^2 + (\gamma C_\delta - 1)|\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 \\
&\leq |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma(1+\delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|^2 - \gamma\lambda(1+\delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

for $0 < \gamma \leq 1/C_\delta$. The idea, introduced in Cascon, Kreuzer, Nochetto, and Siebert (2008), is to use the global upper bound and the Dörfler property (104) to bound fractions of the first two terms by the third term. For any $a, b > 0$ be have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\!|\!| u - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma \|h_{P'}^t r_{P'}\|^2 \\
&\quad\leq (1 - \gamma a)|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma(Ca + 1 + \delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|^2 - \gamma\lambda(1+\delta)\|h_P^t r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}^2 \\
&\quad\leq (1 - \gamma a)|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \gamma(Ca + 1 + \delta - b)\|h_P^t r_P\|^2 \\
&\qquad + \gamma \left(\frac{b}{\vartheta^2} - \lambda(1+\delta) \right) \|h_P^t r_P\|_{\Gamma^*}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

with the constant C coming from the global upper bound. We choose $b = \lambda\vartheta^2 > 0$ so that the third term is negative no matter how small $\delta > 0$ is, and then choose $a > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ so small that $Ca + \delta < b$. □

For $u \in \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)$ the solution of $Au = f$ with $f \in L^2(\Gamma)$, and for $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, we define

$$\operatorname{dist}_0(u, S_P) = \inf_{v \in S_P} \left(|\!|\!| u - v |\!|\!|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(v, P)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{108}$$

Furthermore, for $\varepsilon > 0$ we define

$$\operatorname{card}_0(u, \varepsilon) = \min\{\#P - \#P_0 : P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0),\, \operatorname{dist}_0(u, S_P) \leq \varepsilon\}. \tag{109}$$

The following is an analogue of Proposition 3.7.

Proposition 4.8. *Let the assumption* (94) *of Lemma 4.5 hold. Let* $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$*, and let* $\theta \in (0, \theta^*)$ *with* $\theta^* = \frac{\alpha_1}{C_Q + \beta_1(1+2C_A C_Q)}$*. Suppose that* $R \subseteq P$ *is a subset whose cardinality is minimal up to a constant factor, among all* $R \subseteq P$ *satisfying*

$$\|h_P^t r_P\|^2_{\Gamma^*(R)} \geq \theta \|h_P^t r_P\|^2, \tag{110}$$

where $\Gamma^*(R) = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in R} \overline{\tau}$*. Then we have*

$$\# R \lesssim \operatorname{card}_0(u, \varepsilon), \tag{111}$$

where ε *is defined by*

$$\varepsilon^2 = \frac{\theta^* - \theta}{2C_G \theta^*} \left(\|\!|u - u_P|\!\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \right). \tag{112}$$

Proof. Although this proof is almost a copy of the proof of Proposition 3.7, there is a subtlety caused by the buffer layer of triangles in ω^* as compared to Γ^*. Let

$$e(Q) = \|\!|u - u_Q|\!\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(Q, \Gamma)^2, \qquad Q \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0), \tag{113}$$

and let $P_\varepsilon \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ be such that

$$\# P_\varepsilon - \# P_0 \leq \operatorname{card}_r(u, \varepsilon), \qquad \text{and} \qquad e(P_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^2. \tag{114}$$

Then for $\tilde{P} = P \oplus P_\varepsilon$, from Lemma 4.5 a) we have

$$e(\tilde{P}) \leq C_G e(P_\varepsilon) \leq C_G \varepsilon^2 = \mu e(P), \tag{115}$$

where $\mu = \frac{\theta^* - \theta}{2\theta^*} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and so an application of Lemma 4.5 c) gives

$$\|r_P\|^2_{\omega^*} \geq \theta \|r_P\|^2, \tag{116}$$

where $\omega^* = \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus \tilde{P}} \omega(\tau) = \Gamma^*(\tilde{R})$, with $\tilde{R}$ being the set of triangles in P who has a neighbour in $P \setminus \tilde{P}$. Since R minimizes $\# R$ up to a constant factor, among all subsets $\tilde{R} \subset P$ satisfying the preceding inequality, we infer

$$\# R \lesssim \# \tilde{R} \lesssim \#(P \setminus \tilde{P}) \leq \# \tilde{P} - \# P \leq \# P_\varepsilon - \# P_0 \leq \operatorname{card}_r(u, \varepsilon), \tag{117}$$

where we have used the local finiteness and the estimate in (57), completing the proof. □

For completeness, in the rest of this section we give an explicit pseudocode for the adaptive BEM, then define the relevant approximation classes, and finally record a theorem on quasi-optimality.

```
Algorithm 2: Adaptive BEM ($t > 0$)
parameters: conforming partition $P_0$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$
output    : $P_k \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$ and $u_k \in S_{P_k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$
for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ do
    Compute $u_k \in S_{P_k}$ as the Galerkin approximation of $u$ from $S_{P_k}$;
    Identify a minimal (up to a constant factor) set $R_k \subset P_k$ of triangles satisfying
        $\|h_{P_k}^t r_k\|_{\Gamma^*} \geq \theta \|h_{P_k}^t r_k\|,$    (118)
    where $r_k = f - Au_k$ and $\Gamma^* = \mathrm{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in R_k} \overline{\tau}$;
    Set $P_{k+1}$ as an admissible refinement of $P_k$ with $P_k \setminus P_{k+1} \supseteq R_k$;
endfor
```

As in the previous section, we assume that a procedure to compute $P_{k+1} \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$ from P_k and R_k is specified, satisfying the bound (67). This is justified for newest vertex bisection algorithm in Binev, Dahmen, and DeVore (2004); Stevenson (2008). We define the *approximation class* $\mathcal{A}_{0,s} \subset A^{-1}(L^2(\Gamma))$ with $s \geq 0$ to be the set of u for which

$$|u|_{\mathcal{A}_{0,s}} = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \left(\mathrm{card}_0(u, \varepsilon)^s \varepsilon\right) < \infty. \tag{119}$$

The following result is immediate.

Theorem 4.9. *Let the assumption* (94) *of Lemma 4.5 hold, and in Algorithm 2, suppose that* $\theta \in (0, \theta^*)$ *with* $\theta^* = \frac{\alpha_1}{C_Q + \beta_1(1 + 2C_A C_Q)}$. *Let* $f \in L^2(\Gamma)$ *and* $u \in \mathcal{A}_{0,s}$ *for some* $s > 0$. *Then we have*

$$|\!|\!| u - u_k |\!|\!|^2 + \mathrm{osc}(u_k, P_k)^2 \leq C |u|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{0,s}} (\#P_k - \#P_0)^{-2s}, \tag{120}$$

where $C > 0$ *is a constant.*

5 Negative order operators

Finally, we turn to the case $t < 0$. The domain Γ can be either a closed manifold or a connected polygonal subset of a closed manifold. Recall that we are dealing with the linear homeomorphism $A : \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma) \to H^{-t}(\Gamma)$. We will use the piecewise constant finite element spaces $S_P := S_P^0$, and take conforming triangulations as the class of admissible partitions.

Faermann (2000, 2002) established the equivalence

$$|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 \lesssim \sum_{z \in N_P} |r_P|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} \lesssim |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2, \tag{121}$$

where N_P is the set of all vertices in the triangulation P, and proposed to use the local quantities $|r_P|_{-t,\omega(z)}$ as error indicators for adaptive refinements. An alternative proof, using interpolation spaces appeared in Carstensen, Maischak, and Stephan (2001). However, the discrete local counterparts to this equivalence have been open. On the other hand, the weighted residual type error indicators, $h_\tau^{1+t}|r_P|_{1,\tau}$ for $\tau \in P$, have been around for a while, with a guaranteed global upper bound

$$|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 \lesssim \sum_{\tau\in P} h_\tau^{2(1+t)} |r_P|_{1,\tau}^2, \tag{122}$$

cf. Carstensen et al. (2001). These indicators are computationally more attractive, but for locally refined meshes no global lower bound or discrete local estimates seem to be known. There is a recent claim though on two of those estimates, in Feischl, Karkulik, Melenk, and Praetorius (2011). The following lemma establishes the missing bounds for the afore-mentioned error indicators.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ be with $P \preceq P'$, and let $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau\in P\setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$. Furthermore, with $\omega^* = \omega(\Gamma^*)$, let $\phi \in S^1_{P'}$ be the function such that $\phi \equiv 1$ on Γ^* and $\phi \equiv 0$ outside ω^*. Then for any $v \in S^1_{P'}$, it holds that*

$$|\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\,\omega^*} |r_P|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} + \|h^t_{P'}(r_P - v)\|^2_{\Gamma^*} + \|\phi\, r_P - v\|^2_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)}. \tag{123}$$

In addition to the above, for some $r \in [-t, \frac{3}{2}) \cap (0, \frac{1}{2} - 2t) \cap [0, \nu]$, let $f \in H^r(\Gamma)$ and let $A : \tilde{H}^{r+2t}(\Gamma) \to H^r(\Gamma)$ be bounded. Then for any $v \in S^1_{\hat{P}}$ and $w \in S_{P'}$, where $\hat{P}$ is the uniform refinement of P, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z\in N_P\cap\,\omega^*} |r_P|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\,\omega^*} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(z)} \lesssim |\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 \\ + \|h^t_P(r_P - w)\|^2_{\omega^*} + \|h^t_P(r_P - v)\|^2_{\omega^*} + \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\,\omega^*} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P - v|^2_{r,\omega(z)},\end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

where $h_z = \min_{\{\tau : z\in\overline{\tau}\}} h_\tau$. Moreover, for any $v \in S^1_{\hat{P}}$, we have the global bounds

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z\in N_P} |r_P|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(z)} \lesssim |\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 \\ + \|h^t_P(r_P - v)\|^2 + \sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P - v|^2_{r,\omega(z)}.\end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

Remark 5.2. In a previous version of this article, the local discrete upper bound (123) involved the factor $\|h_{P'}/h_P\|_\infty^{-t}$ on the left hand side (which allowed to remove the oscillation terms). It does not cause trouble as long as one is concerned with refinements P' of P that are not too deep, such as the ones that occur in practice. However, it is not effective in the current approach to optimality proofs as one has to consider arbitrary refinements of P, cf.

Lemma 3.4 c), Lemma 4.5 c), and Lemma 5.6 c) below. This observation was communicated to the author by Dirk Praetorius. In the current version, the afore-mentioned factor is removed with the help of the oscillation terms, and the rest of this section is rewritten to reflect this change.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Set $s = -t > 0$. Let $e = u_{P'} - u_P$, and let $e_P \in S_P$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection of e onto S_P. Then for any $v \in S^1_{P'}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Ae, e\rangle = \langle r_P, e\rangle = \langle r_P, e - e_P\rangle = \langle r_P, e\rangle_{\Gamma^*} = \langle r_P - v, e\rangle_{\Gamma^*} + \langle v, e\rangle_{\Gamma^*} \\ \leq \|h_{P'}^{-s}(r_P - v)\|_{\Gamma^*}\|h_{P'}^{s}e\|_{\Gamma^*} + \|v\|_{H^s}\|e\|_{\tilde{H}^{-s}},\end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

where we have used the fact that $e - e_P = 0$ outside Γ^*. Upon using the inverse inequality $\|h_{P'}^{s}e\| \lesssim \|e\|_{\tilde{H}^{-s}}$, this gives

$$|\!|\!|e|\!|\!| \lesssim \|h_{P'}^{-s}(r_P - v)\|_{\Gamma^*} + \|v\|_{H^s} \lesssim \|h_{P'}^{-s}(r_P - v)\|_{\Gamma^*} + \|\phi\, r_P - v\|_{H^s} + \|\phi\, r_P\|_{H^s}. \tag{127}$$

To localize the last term, we follow an approach from Carstensen et al. (2001). With $\phi_z \in S^1_P$ the standard nodal basis function at $z \in N_P$, we have

$$\|\phi\, r_P\|_{H^s} \lesssim \sum_{z \in N_P \cap \omega^*} \|\phi_z r_P\|_{H^s(\omega(z))}, \tag{128}$$

and then using the fact that the linear operator $T : H^s(\omega(z)) \to H^s(\omega(z))$ defined by $Tf = (f - \langle f, 1\rangle_{\omega(z)})\phi_z$ satisfies $\|Tf\|_{H^s} \lesssim |f|_{H^s(\omega(z))}$, we get the upper bound (123).

For the lower bounds, we first prove a couple of inequalities involving the auxiliary error indicator $\|h_P^{-s} r_P\|_\tau$. Let $w \in S_{P'}$, and let $w_P \in S_P$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection of $h_P^{-2s} w$ onto S_P. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle h_P^{-s} w, h_P^{-s} w\rangle &= \langle w - r_P, h_P^{-2s} w\rangle + \langle A(u_{P'} - u_P), h_P^{-2s} w - w_P\rangle \\ &\leq \langle w - r_P, h_P^{-2s} w\rangle + \|A(u_{P'} - u_P)\|_{H^s(\Gamma^*)}\|h_P^{-2s} w - w_P\|_{\tilde{H}^{-s}(\Gamma^*)} \\ &\lesssim \|h_P^{-s}(w - r_P)\|_{\operatorname{supp} w}\|h_P^{-s} w\| + \|u_{P'} - u_P\|_{H^{-s}(\Gamma)}\|h_P^{-s} w\|_{\Gamma^*},\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

where in the last step we used (20), and so

$$\|h_P^{-s} r_P\|_{\operatorname{supp} w} \lesssim |\!|\!|u_P - u_{P'}|\!|\!| + \|h_P^{-s}(r_P - w)\|_{\operatorname{supp} w}. \tag{130}$$

Let $v \in L^2$, and let $v_P \in S_P$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection of v onto S_P. Using (20), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle h^{-s} r_P, h^s v\rangle = \langle r_P, v\rangle = \langle A(u - u_P), v - v_P\rangle \\ \lesssim \|A(u - u_P)\|_{H^s(\Gamma)}\|v - v_P\|_{\tilde{H}^{-s}(\Gamma)} \lesssim |\!|\!|u - u_P|\!|\!|\|h^s v\|,\end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

establishing

$$\|h_P^{-s} r_P\| \lesssim |\!|\!|u - u_P|\!|\!|. \tag{132}$$

On the other hand, for any $N \subseteq N_P$ and $v \in S^1_{\hat{P}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{z\in N} h_z^{2(r-s)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(z)} &\lesssim \sum_{z\in N} \Big(h_z^{2(r-s)} |v|^2_{r,\omega(z)} + h_z^{2(r-s)} |r_P - v|^2_{r,\omega(z)} \Big) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{z\in N} \Big(\|h_P^{-s} v\|^2_{\omega(z)} + h_z^{2(r-s)} |r_P - v|^2_{r,\omega(z)} \Big) \\
&\lesssim \|h_P^{-s} v\|^2_{\gamma} + \sum_{z\in N} h_z^{2(r-s)} |r_P - v|^2_{r,\omega(z)} \\
&\lesssim \|h_P^{-s} r_P\|^2_{\gamma} + \|h_P^{-s}(v - r_P)\|^2_{\gamma} + \sum_{z\in N} h_z^{2(r-s)} |r_P - v|^2_{r,\omega(z)},
\end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

where $\gamma = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{z\in N} \omega(z)$. Then the second inequalities in (124) and (125) follow from (130) and (132), respectively. Finally, the first inequalities in (124) and (125) are a consequence of the fact that r_P is L^2-orthogonal to S_P. ☐

Let us record some useful bounds on the various oscillation terms that appeared in the preceding lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ be with $P \preceq P'$, and let $\gamma = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau\in Q} \overline{\tau}$ with some $Q \subseteq P$. Assume that $f \in H^r(\Gamma)$ and that $A : \tilde{H}^{r+2t}(\Gamma) \to H^r(\Gamma)$ is bounded for some $r \in (-t, \frac{3}{2}) \cap (0, \frac{1}{2} - 2t) \cap [0, \nu]$, so that $r_P \in H^r(\Gamma)$. Then we have*

$$\min_{w\in S_{P'}} \|h_P^t (r_P - w)\|^2_{\gamma} \lesssim \sum_{\tau\in Q} h_\tau^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\tau}. \tag{134}$$

With $v = Q_{\hat{P}} r_P \in S^1_{\hat{P}}$ the quasi-interpolant of r_P, we also have

$$\|h_P^t (r_P - v)\|^2_{\gamma} + \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\gamma} |r_P - v|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\overline{\gamma}} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(z)}, \tag{135}$$

where $h_z = \min_{\{\tau : z\in\overline{\tau}\}} h_\tau$. Finally, with Γ^* and ω^* as in Lemma 5.1, there exists $v \in S^1_{P'}$ such that $v = 0$ outside ω^* and that

$$\|h_{P'}^t (r_P - v)\|^2_{\Gamma^*} + \|\phi\, r_P - v\|^2_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\,\omega^*} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(z)}. \tag{136}$$

Proof. The estimate (134) is a standard direct estimate, and (135) follows from

$$\sum_{z\in N_P\cap\gamma} \|r_P - v\|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\gamma} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(\omega((z))} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P\cap\overline{\gamma}} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(z)}, \tag{137}$$

where we have used (21), (17), and the local finiteness of the mesh.

For (136), let $v \in S^1_{P'}$ be defined by

$$v = \sum_{z \in N_{P'} \cap \omega^*} \langle r_P, 1 \rangle_{\omega'(z)} \phi_z, \tag{138}$$

where $\phi_z \in S^1_{P'}$ is the standard nodal basis function at $z \in N_{P'}$, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\omega'(z)}$ is the L^2-inner product on the star $\omega'(z)$ around z with respect to P'. Then we have

$$\|h^t_{P'}(r_P - v)\|^2_{\Gamma^*} \lesssim \sum_{z \in N_{P'} \cap \omega^*} |r_P|^2_{-t,\omega'(z)} \lesssim \sum_{z \in N_P \cap \omega^*} |r_P|^2_{-t,\omega(z)}, \tag{139}$$

and from $r_P \perp_{L^2} S_P$ we infer the bound (136) for its first term. For the second term, we have

$$\phi\, r_P - v = \sum_{z \in N_{P'} \cap \omega^*} \left(r_P - \langle r_P, 1 \rangle_{\omega'(z)}\right) \phi_z, \tag{140}$$

and hence

$$\|\phi\, r_P - v\|^2_{H^{-t}(\Gamma)} \lesssim \sum_{z \in N_{P'} \cap \omega^*} \left\| \left(r_P - \langle r_P, 1 \rangle_{\omega'(z)}\right) \phi_z \right\|^2_{H^{-t}(\omega'(z))}. \tag{141}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5.1, now by using the boundedness of $f \mapsto \left(f - \langle f, 1 \rangle_{\omega'(z)}\right) \phi_z$ in $H^{-t}(\omega'(z))$, and then by employing the orthogonality $r_P \perp_{L^2} S_P$ again, we establish the proof. □

Remark 5.4 (Saturation assumption). For a large number of non-residual *a posteriori* error estimators for Symm's integral equation on curves, Erath, Ferraz-Leite, Funken, and Praetorius (2009a) proved that the estimators are equivalent to the global error, with the upper bound depending on the saturation assumption: $\|u - u_P\| \lesssim \|\hat{u}_P - u_P\|$, where $\hat{u}_P$ is the Galerkin approximation from some enriched space $\hat{S}_P \supset S_P$, which is typically the piecewise constants on a uniform refinement of P, or piecewise linears on P. By using Lemma 5.1, we can justify this assumption up to oscillation when $\hat{S}_P$ is the space of piecewise constants on a uniform refinement of P. Namely, the local lower bound (124) with $r = -t$, and the global upper bound from (121), together give

$$\|u - u_P\|^2 \lesssim \|u_{P'} - u_P\|^2 + \|h^t_P(r_P - w)\|^2 + \|h^t_P(r_P - v)\|^2 + \sum_{z \in N_P} \|r_P - v\|^2_{-t,\omega(z)}, \tag{142}$$

for any $w \in S_{P'}$ and $v \in S^1_{\hat{P}}$. Taking P' equal to $\hat{P}$ (the uniform refinement of P) implies the saturation assumption up to the oscillation terms.

Remark 5.5 (Weighted residual indicators). Putting $r = 1$ in (124) and (125), one gets bounds for the weighted residual indicators from (122). Taking into account the preceding lemma, the oscillation terms in the global lower bound (125) can be estimated as

$$\|h^t_P(r_P - v)\|^2 + \sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{2(1-t)} |r_P - v|^2_{1,\tau} \lesssim \sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{2(1-t)} |r_P|^2_{1,\tau}, \tag{143}$$

for $v \in S^1_{\hat{P}}$ minimizing the left hand side. Hence the estimator dominates the oscillation. This observation suggests that arguments similar to the ones given in the preceding section might lead to a proof of quasi-optimality of an adaptive algorithm based on the weighted residual indicators. A proof of a certain optimality result in this setting has been announced in Feischl et al. (2011), with the details appearing in a forthcoming paper.

Combining (123) and (136), for the Faermann indicators we get

$$|\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 \lesssim \sum_{z \in N_P \cap \omega^*} |r_P|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} + \sum_{z \in N_P \cap \omega^*} h_z^{2(r+t)} |r_P|^2_{r,\omega(z)}. \tag{144}$$

By (124), the entire right hand side is controlled by the last term alone. This leads to generalized weighted residual indicators, for which we already have the global bounds (125). Obviously, the case $r = 1$, treated in Feischl et al. (2011) is computationally more attractive, but the remaining cases $r \in (-t, 1)$ become important if for instance $f \in H^r(\Gamma) \setminus H^1(\Gamma)$.

In the following, we *fix* some $r \in (-t, \frac{3}{2}) \cap (0, \frac{1}{2} - 2t) \cap [0, \nu]$ and assume that $f \in H^r(\Gamma)$, and that $A : \tilde{H}^{r+2t}(\Gamma) \to H^r(\Gamma)$ is bounded. Then defining the *error estimator*

$$\eta(v, P, \gamma) = \left(\sum_{z \in N_P \cap \overline{\gamma}} h_z^{2(r+t)} |f - Av|^2_{r,\omega(z)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{145}$$

for $\gamma \subseteq \Gamma$ and $v \in S_P$, with $\eta(P, \gamma) = \eta(u_P, P, \gamma)$, in the context of Lemma 5.1 we have

$$|\!|\!| u_P - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 \leq \beta_1 \eta(P, \Gamma^*)^2, \tag{146}$$

where $\beta_1 > 0$ is a constant we will refer to later. Let there be a map $z \mapsto \tau_P(z) : N_P \to P$ for any $P \in \text{adm}(P_0)$, satisfying $z \in \overline{\tau_P(z)}$. For $v \in S_P$, let

$$\text{osc}(v, P) = \left(\| h_P^t (f - Av - w) \|^2 + \sum_{z \in N_{\hat{P}}} h_z^{2(r+t)} |f - Av - w|^2_{r,\hat{\omega}(z)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{147}$$

where $\hat{\omega}(z)$ is the star around $z \in N_{\hat{P}}$ with respect to the partition $\hat{P}$, and $w = Q_{\hat{P}}(f - Av) \in S^1_{\hat{P}}$ is the quasi-interpolator of $f - Av$, defined by

$$Q_{\hat{P}} g = \sum_{z \in N_{\hat{P}}} g_z(z) \phi_z, \tag{148}$$

$\phi_z \in S_{\hat{P}}$ is the standard nodal basis function at z, and $g_z \in \mathbb{P}_1$ is the L^2-orthogonal projection of g onto the affine functions on $\tau_{\hat{P}}(z)$. This quasi-interpolator, as a variation on the Clément interpolator, is introduced in Oswald (1994). We remark that we will only need the idempotence $Q^2_{\hat{P}} = Q_{\hat{P}}$, so for example the Scott-Zhang operator could have been employed instead. Let $g' = g - Q_{\hat{P}}g$ with $g \in H^r(\Gamma)$, and let $y \in N_P$. Then by idempotence, we have

$$|g'|^2_{r,\omega(y)} = |g' - Q_{\hat{P}}g'|^2_{r,\omega(y)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_{\hat{P}}\cap\overline{\omega(z)}} |(g' - g'_z(z))\phi_z|^2_{r,\hat{\omega}(z)}, \tag{149}$$

which implies by the boundedness of $g' \mapsto (g' - g'_z(z))\phi_z$ in $H^r(\hat{\omega}(z))$, that

$$\sum_{y\in N_P} |g - Q_{\hat{P}}g|^2_{r,\omega(y)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_{\hat{P}}} |g - Q_{\hat{P}}g|^2_{r,\hat{\omega}(z)}. \tag{150}$$

In particular, in the context of Lemma 5.1 we have

$$\|\!|u - u_P|\!\|^2 \lesssim \alpha_1\eta(P,\Gamma)^2 \leq \|\!|u - u_P|\!\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2, \tag{151}$$

where $\alpha_1 > 0$ is a constant. On the other hand, by stability of $Q_{\hat{P}}$ there exists a constant $C_Q > 0$ such that

$$\|h_P^t(r_P - Q_{\hat{P}}r_P)\|^2_{\hat{\omega}(\gamma)} + \sum_{z\in N_{\hat{P}}\cap\overline{\hat{\omega}(\gamma)}} h_z^{2(r+t)}|r_P - Q_{\hat{P}}r_P|^2_{r,\hat{\omega}(z)} \leq C_Q\eta(P,\gamma)^2, \tag{152}$$

for any $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ and $\gamma \subseteq \Gamma$, with $\hat{\omega}(\gamma) = \bigcup\{\hat{\omega}(z) : z \in N_{\hat{P}} \cap \overline{\gamma}\}$.

In the rest of this section, we follow the pattern of the preceding two sections, and the proofs will be brief as similar proofs are given in the previous sections.

Lemma 5.6. *Assume that*

$$\sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(r+t)}|Av|^2_{r,\omega(z)} \leq C_A\|\!|v|\!\|^2, \qquad v \in S_P, \tag{153}$$

for $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, with the constant $C_A = C_A(A, \sigma_s, \sigma_g)$. Then the followings hold.

a) There is a constant $C_G > 0$ such that

$$\|\!|u - u_P|\!\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 \leq C_G \inf_{v\in S_P}\left(\|\!|u - v|\!\|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(v, P)^2\right), \tag{154}$$

for any $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$.

b) There exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\eta(P',\Gamma)^2 \leq (1+\delta)\eta(P,\Gamma)^2 - \lambda(1+\delta)\eta(P,\Gamma^*)^2 + C_\delta\|\!|u_P - u_{P'}|\!\|^2, \tag{155}$$

for any $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ with $P \preceq P'$, and for any $\delta > 0$, with C_δ depending on δ, where $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int}\bigcup_{\tau\in P\setminus P'}\overline{\tau}$.

c) Let $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ *be such that* $P \preceq P'$*, and let* $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$*. If, for some* $\mu \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ *it holds that*

$$|\!|\!| u - u_{P'} |\!|\!|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_{P'}, P')^2 \leq \mu \left(|\!|\!| u - u_P |\!|\!|^2 + \operatorname{osc}(u_P, P)^2 \right), \tag{156}$$

then with $\theta = \frac{\alpha_1(1-2\mu)}{C_Q + \beta_1(1+2C_A C_Q)}$*, we have*

$$\eta(P, \Gamma^*)^2 \geq \theta\, \eta(P, \Gamma)^2, \tag{157}$$

where $\alpha_1 > 0$ *and* $\beta_1 > 0$ *are the constant from* (151) *and* (146)*, respectively.*

Remark 5.7. The estimate (153) is proved in Section 6 for a general class of singular integral operators of negative order, under the hypothesis that $\hat{A} : H^{t+\sigma}(\Omega) \to H^{-t+\sigma}(\Omega)$ is bounded for some $\sigma > \frac{n}{2}$, and that $0 < r + t < \sigma$, where $\hat{A}$ is an extension of A to Ω if Γ is open, and $\hat{A} = A$ if $\Gamma = \Omega$. Recalling that Ω is a $C^{\nu-1,1}$-manifold, the condition on σ translates to $\nu > \frac{n}{2} - t$, see Remark 6.3 for details. Therefore for $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ we need a $C^{1,1}$ curve or a surface, respectively, assuming that $\frac{1}{2} \leq -t < 1$. Note that if Γ is open, the boundary of Γ is allowed to be Lipschitz.

Proof of Lemma 5.6. The proofs of a) and c) go along the same lines as the corresponding proofs from the previous section, cf. Lemma 4.5. In particular, the stability (152) and the locality of $Q_{\hat{P}}$ are important.

Claim b) is established if we show that

$$\sum_{z \in N_{P'} \cap \overline{\Gamma^*}} h_z^{2(r+t)} |g|^2_{r,\omega'(z)} \leq \lambda \sum_{y \in N_P \cap \overline{\Gamma^*}} h_y^{2(r+t)} |g|^2_{r,\omega(y)}, \qquad g \in H^r(\Gamma), \tag{158}$$

with some constant $\lambda < 1$, where $\omega'(z)$ is the star around $z \in N_{P'}$ with respect to the partition P'. For $\tau, \sigma \in P'$, let $I(\tau, \sigma)$ denote the interaction term between τ and σ in the Slobodeckij (double integral) norm of g. First of all, any diagonal term $I(\tau, \tau)$ that appears in the left hand side also appears in the right hand side, and the corresponding factors satisfy $h_z \leq \lambda_0 h_y$ with some constant $\lambda_0 < 1$. Henceforth we concentrate on the off-diagonal terms. Note that by symmetry the order of τ and σ is not important, and that the number of occurrences of the particular (unordered) pair (τ, σ) in the left hand side of (158) is equal to the number of $z \in N_{P'} \cap \overline{\Gamma^*}$ satisfying $\tau, \sigma \subset \omega'(z)$. Suppose that the pair (τ, σ) appears in the left hand side exactly ℓ times, for $\ell \in [0, n-1]$. Thus τ and σ are contained in two triangles from P that share a k-face for some $k \in [\ell - 1, n]$, where $k = n$ means that the two triangles coincide. If this face is in $\overline{\Gamma^*}$, then the vertices of this face give at least ℓ points $y \in N_P \cap \overline{\Gamma^*}$ such that $\tau, \sigma \subset \omega(y)$, meaning that the same pair appears in the right hand side at least ℓ times. On the other hand, if the shared face is not in $\overline{\Gamma^*}$, this would mean that τ and σ are triangles from P, and they interact through only the vertices on $N_P \cap \partial\Gamma^*$. We also see that the corresponding factors $h_z^{2(r+t)}$ shrink since h_z is defined by taking minimum as $h_z = \min_{\{\tau \in P' : z \in \overline{\tau}\}} h_\tau$, proving the claim (158). $\square$

Proposition 5.8. *Let the assumption* (153) *of Lemma* 5.6 *hold. Let* $P, P' \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$ *be admissible partitions with* $P \preceq P'$, *and let* $\Gamma^* = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in P \setminus P'} \overline{\tau}$. *Suppose, for some* $\vartheta \in (0,1)$ *that*

$$\eta(P, \Gamma^*) \geq \vartheta \, \eta(P, \Gamma). \tag{159}$$

Then there exist constants $\gamma \geq 0$ *and* $\mu \in (0,1)$ *such that*

$$|||u - u_{P'}|||^2 + \gamma \, \eta(P', \Gamma)^2 \leq \mu \left(|||u - u_P|||^2 + \gamma \, \eta(P, \Gamma)^2 \right). \tag{160}$$

Gearing towards a convergence rate analysis, for $u \in \tilde{H}^t(\Gamma)$ the solution of $Au = f$ with $f \in H^r(\Gamma)$, and for $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, we define

$$\operatorname{dist}_r(u, S_P) = \inf_{v \in S_P} \left(|||u - v|||^2 + \operatorname{osc}(v, P)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{161}$$

Furthermore, for $\varepsilon > 0$ we define

$$\operatorname{card}_r(u, \varepsilon) = \min\{\#P - \#P_0 : P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0), \operatorname{dist}_r(u, S_P) \leq \varepsilon\}. \tag{162}$$

We have the following result on the Dörfler marking, whose proof is entirely analogous to the proof of Proposition 4.8.

Proposition 5.9. *Let the assumption* (153) *of Lemma* 5.6 *hold. Let* $P \in \operatorname{adm}(P_0)$, *and let* $\theta \in (0, \theta^*)$ *with* $\theta^* = \frac{\alpha_1}{1 + \beta_1(1 + 2C_A)}$. *Suppose that* $R \subseteq P$ *is a subset whose cardinality is minimal up to a constant factor, among all* $R \subseteq P$ *satisfying*

$$\eta(P, \Gamma^*(R))^2 \geq \theta \, \eta(P, \Gamma)^2. \tag{163}$$

where $\Gamma^*(R) = \operatorname{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in R} \overline{\tau}$. *Then we have*

$$\#R \lesssim \operatorname{card}_r(u, \varepsilon), \tag{164}$$

where ε *is defined by*

$$\varepsilon^2 = \frac{\theta^* - \theta}{2C_G \theta^*} \left(|||u - u_P|||^2 + \operatorname{osc}(P, \Gamma)^2 \right). \tag{165}$$

Now let us specify our adaptive algorithm.

Algorithm 3: Adaptive BEM ($t < 0$)

```
parameters: conforming partition $P_0$, and $\theta \in [0,1]$
output    : $P_k \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$ and $u_k \in S_{P_k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$
for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$ do
    Compute $u_k \in S_{P_k}$ as the Galerkin approximation of $u$ from $S_{P_k}$;
    Identify a minimal (up to a constant factor) set $R_k \subset P_k$ of triangles satisfying
        $\eta(P_k, \Gamma^*)^2 \geq \theta\, \eta(P_k, \Gamma)^2,$    (166)
    where $r_k = f - Au_k$ and $\Gamma^* = \mathrm{int} \bigcup_{\tau \in R_k} \overline{\tau}$;
    Set $P_{k+1}$ as an admissible refinement of $P_k$ with $P_k \setminus P_{k+1} \supseteq R_k$;
endfor
```

As in the previous sections, we assume that a procedure to compute $P_{k+1} \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$ from P_k and R_k is specified, satisfying the bound (67). This is justified for newest vertex bisection algorithm in Binev, Dahmen, and DeVore (2004); Stevenson (2008), and moreover, can be demonstrated for the red refinement procedure by adapting their techniques. Finally, we introduce the *approximation class* $\mathcal{A}_{r,s} \subset A^{-1}(H^r(\Gamma))$ with $s \geq 0$ to be the set of u for which

$$|u|_{\mathcal{A}_{r,s}} = \sup_{\varepsilon > 0} \left(\mathrm{card}_r(u, \varepsilon)^s \varepsilon \right) < \infty, \tag{167}$$

and record that our adaptive BEM produces optimally converging approximations.

Theorem 5.10. *Let the assumption* (153) *of Lemma* 5.6 *hold, and in Algorithm* 3*, suppose that* $\theta \in (0, \theta^*)$ *with* $\theta^* = \frac{\alpha_1}{1+\beta_1(1+2C_A)}$*. Let* $f \in H^r(\Gamma)$ *and* $u \in \mathcal{A}_{r,s}$ *for some* $s > 0$*. Then we have*

$$|\!|\!| u - u_k |\!|\!|^2 + \mathrm{osc}(P_k, \Gamma)^2 \leq C |u|^2_{\mathcal{A}_{r,s}} (\#P_k - \#P_0)^{-2s}, \tag{168}$$

where $C > 0$ *is a constant.*

6 Inverse-type inequalities

In this section we shall justify the inverse-type inequality (25), which has been used in Lemmata 3.4, 4.5, and 5.6, and hence played a crucial role in our analysis. We allow a general class of singular integral operators, specified by the assumptions that follow.

We keep the assumptions formulated in Section 2 still in force. We will be concerned only with closed manifolds (i.e., $\Gamma = \Omega$), since the case of open surfaces $\Gamma \subset \Omega$ would follow by restriction. In addition, we assume that Ω is embedded in some Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^N$, so that the Euclidean distance function $\mathrm{dist} : \Omega \times \Omega \to [0, \infty)$ is well defined. Instead of the operator A that featured in the previous sections, we will consider in this section a more general *bounded linear* operator $T : H^t(\Omega) \to H^{-t}(\Omega)$, hence removing the self-adjointness and coerciveness assumptions. With $\Delta = \{(x,x) : x \in \Omega\}$ the diagonal of $\Omega \times \Omega$, we assume that there is a kernel $K \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega \times \Omega \setminus \Delta)$ associated to T, meaning that

$$\langle Tu, v\rangle = \langle K, u \otimes v\rangle, \tag{169}$$

whenever $u, v \in C^{\nu-1,1}(\Omega)$ have disjoint supports. We assume that K is smooth on

$$\Sigma = \{\tau \times \tau' : \tau, \tau' \in P_0\} \setminus \Delta \subset \Omega \times \Omega \setminus \Delta, \tag{170}$$

satisfying the estimate

$$|\partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_\eta K(\xi,\eta)| \leq \frac{C_{\alpha,\beta}}{\mathrm{dist}(\xi,\eta)^{n+2t+|\alpha|+|\beta|}}, \qquad (\xi,\eta) \in \Sigma, \tag{171}$$

for all multi-indices α and β satisfying $n + 2t + |\alpha| + |\beta| > 0$. Note that the partial derivatives are understood in local coordinates (or, as we discussed in §2, in terms of the reference triangles). The kernels satisfying this smoothness condition has been called *standard kernels*, e.g., in Dahmen, Harbrecht, and Schneider (2006). Then one can show that the kernels of a wide range of boundary integral operators are standard kernels, cf. Schneider (1998).

Theorem 6.1. *With T^* denoting the adjoint of T, let both $T, T^* : H^{t+\sigma}(\Omega) \to H^{-t+\sigma}(\Omega)$ be bounded for some $\sigma > \frac{n}{2}$. Moreover, let $s \geq 0$ and $0 < s + t < \sigma$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{z \in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \|Tv\|^2_{H^s(\omega(z))} \lesssim \|v\|^2_{H^t(\Omega)}, \qquad v \in S_P, \tag{172}$$

for $P \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$, where N_P is the set of all vertices in the triangulation P, $\omega(z)$ is the star around z with respect to P, and $h_z = \min_{\{\tau : z \in \overline{\tau}\}} h_\tau$.

Corollary 6.2. *Under the setting of the preceding theorem, we have*

$$\sum_{\tau \in P} h_\tau^{2(s+t)} \|Tv\|^2_{H^s(\tau)} \lesssim \|v\|^2_{H^t(\Omega)}, \qquad v \in S_P, \tag{173}$$

for $P \in \mathrm{adm}(P_0)$.

Remark 6.3. The boundedness of both $T, T^* : H^{t+\sigma}(\Omega) \to H^{-t+\sigma}(\Omega)$ has been proved for $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$ for general boundary integral operators on Lipschitz surfaces in Costabel (1988), and the endpoint case $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ is established for boundary integral operators associated to the Laplace operator on Lipschitz domains in Verchota (1984). Unfortunately, we see that the preceding results require more than $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\nu \geq \sigma + |t|$, we necessarily have $\nu > \frac{n}{2} + |t|$. This allows Lipschitz curves for $|t| < \frac{1}{2}$, and $C^{1,1}$ curves and surfaces for $|t| < 1$. Even though in general it rules out polyhedral surfaces, note that for the case of an open surface Γ, its boundary can be Lipschitz polygonal, as long as one can find a smooth enough manifold Ω with $\Gamma \subset \Omega$. As for the question of whether the boundedness holds for $\sigma < \nu - \frac{1}{2}$ for $C^{\nu-1,1}$ domains, let us note that the main ingredients of the results in Costabel (1988) are the near-optimal trace theorem for Lipschitz domains, which appears in Costabel (1988) and Ding (1996), and a certain regularity result for the Poincaré-Steklov operator for Lipschitz domains, which appears, e.g., in McLean (2000). The relevant version of the trace theorem has been proved for $C^{\nu-1,1}$ domains in Kim (2007), see also Marschall (1987). For the regularity of the Poincaré-Steklov operator, the author has not been able to locate in the literature a result strong enough to give the boundedness for $\sigma < \nu - \frac{1}{2}$, although there are results, e.g., in McLean (2000), that imply $\sigma = \nu - 1$ for standard boundary integral operators.

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is divided into several lemmas that follow. The main idea is to decompose Tv into the part that is in S_P, which we call the *low frequency* part, and its complement, which we call the *high frequency* part. The low frequency part is readily handled by either the standard inverse estimates or the new inverse estimates from Dahmen, Faermann, Graham, Hackbusch, and Sauter (2004). To treat the high frequency part, we introduce a wavelet basis for the complement of S_P, and as naturally suggested by the techniques we use, the high frequency part is further decomposed into terms corresponding to *far-field*, *near-field*, and *local* interactions. Please be warned that these names are only suggestive in that, e.g., the local interaction terms may contain interactions between two wavelets with non-overlapping supports, although they cannot be too far apart.

Our main analytic tool is a locally supported wavelet basis for the energy space H^t, with the dual multiresolution analysis based on piecewise polynomial-type spaces. More specifically, we assume that there is a Riesz basis $\Psi = \{\psi_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\nabla}$ of H^t of *wavelet type*, whose dual, denoted by $\tilde{\Psi} = \{\tilde{\psi}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\nabla}$, is locally supported piecewise polynomial wavelets, where ∇ is a countable index set. Now we expand on what we mean exactly by the various adjectives such as "wavelet type" that characterize the bases Ψ and $\tilde{\Psi}$.

The collections $\Psi \subset H^t(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{\Psi} \subset H^{-t}(\Omega)$ are biorthogonal: $\langle \psi_\lambda, \tilde{\psi}_\mu \rangle = \delta_{\lambda\mu}$, and are *Riesz bases* for their corresponding spaces, meaning that

$$\left\|\textstyle\sum_{\lambda\in\nabla} v_\lambda \psi_\lambda\right\|_{H^t(\Omega)} \eqsim \|(v_\lambda)_\lambda\|_{\ell^2(\nabla)}, \qquad \left\|\textstyle\sum_{\lambda\in\nabla} v_\lambda \tilde{\psi}_\lambda\right\|_{H^{-t}(\Omega)} \eqsim \|(v_\lambda)_\lambda\|_{\ell^2(\nabla)}, \tag{174}$$

for any sequence $(v_\lambda)_\lambda \in \ell^2(\nabla)$. Here the notation $X \eqsim Y$ means $Y \lesssim X \lesssim Y$. Each wavelet ψ_λ or $\tilde{\psi}_\lambda$ has a scale, which is encoded by the function $|\cdot| : \nabla \to \mathbb{N}$. We say that ψ_λ and $\tilde{\psi}_\lambda$ have the scale $2^{-|\lambda|}$, which is justified by the *locality* properties

$$\operatorname{diam}(\operatorname{supp}\psi_\lambda) \lesssim 2^{-|\lambda|}, \qquad \operatorname{diam}(\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\psi}_\lambda) \lesssim 2^{-|\lambda|}. \tag{175}$$

We will also assume that the wavelet supports are *locally finite*, in the sense that

$$\#\{\lambda : |\lambda| = \ell,\, B(x, 2^{-\ell}) \cap \operatorname{supp}\psi_\lambda \neq \varnothing\} \lesssim 1, \tag{176}$$

and similarly for the dual wavelets, where the bounds do not depend on $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \Omega$, and $B(x,\rho) = \{y \in \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(x,y) < \rho\}$. An immediate consequence of this property is that $\#\{\lambda \in \nabla : |\lambda| = \ell\} \lesssim 2^{n\ell}$.

We assume that the wavelets have the so-called *cancellation property of order* $d \in \mathbb{N}$, saying that[2] there exists a constant $\eta > 0$, such that for any $p \in [1,\infty]$, for all continuous, piecewise smooth functions v on P_0 and $\lambda \in \nabla$,

$$|\langle v, \psi_\lambda \rangle| \lesssim 2^{-|\lambda|(\frac{n}{2}-\frac{n}{p}+t+d)} \max_{\tau \in P_0} |v|_{W^{d,p}(B(\operatorname{supp}\psi_\lambda, 2^{-|\lambda|}\eta)\cap\tau)}, \tag{177}$$

where for $A \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $B(A,\varepsilon) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N : \operatorname{dist}(A,y) < \varepsilon\}$.

Furthermore, we assume that for all $r \in [-d,\gamma)$, $s < \gamma$, necessarily with $|s|, |r| \le \nu$,

$$\|w\|_{H^r(\Omega)} \lesssim 2^{\ell(r-s)} \|w\|_{H^s(\Omega)}, \qquad \text{for} \quad w \in \operatorname{span}\{\psi_\lambda : |\lambda| = \ell\}, \tag{178}$$

with $\gamma = \sup\{s : \Psi \subset H^s(\Omega)\}$, and similarly for the dual wavelets, with γ and d replaced by $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{d}$, respectively.

We assume that the norm equivalence

$$\left\| \sum_{\lambda\in\nabla} v_\lambda \tilde{\psi}_\lambda \right\|^2_{H^s(\Omega)} \eqsim \sum_{\lambda\in\nabla} 2^{2(s+t)|\lambda|} |v_\lambda|^2, \tag{179}$$

is valid for $s \in (0,d) \cap (0,\tilde{\gamma})$.

For $\lambda \in \nabla$, we define $\Omega_\lambda = \Omega \cap B_\lambda$, with B_λ an open ball with $\operatorname{diam}(B_\lambda) \lesssim 2^{-|\lambda|}$, containing both $\operatorname{supp}\psi_\lambda$ and $\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\psi}_\lambda$. Thus Ω_λ can be thought of as a common support of ψ_λ and $\tilde{\psi}_\lambda$. We then define

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda : \Omega_\lambda \cap \tau \neq \varnothing \text{ and } \operatorname{diam}(\Omega_\lambda) \ge \delta h_\tau \text{ for some } \tau \in P\}, \tag{180}$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a constant so small that $\Omega_\lambda \cap \tau \neq \varnothing$ and $\lambda \notin \Lambda$ imply $\Omega_\lambda \subset \omega(\tau)$ for $\tau \in P$, and assume that

$$\|v\|_{H^s(\Omega)} \lesssim \|h_P^{-s} v\|, \qquad v \in S_\Lambda := \operatorname{span}\{\tilde{\psi}_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}, \tag{181}$$

for $s \in [0,\nu]$. By a duality argument (test v against $w \eqsim h_P^{2s} v$) this implies

$$\|h_P^s v\| \lesssim \|v\|_{H^{-s}(\Omega)}, \qquad v \in S_\Lambda, \tag{182}$$

for $s \in [0,\nu]$.

Remark 6.4. Concrete examples of wavelet bases satisfying all our assumptions are given by the *duals* of the bases constructed in Dahmen and Schneider (1999). On triangulations over a Lipschitz polyhedral surface, one can also use the construction in Stevenson (2003). The only reason for insisting on polynomial dual wavelets is that in the proof of Lemma 6.5 below, we use the inverse estimate (182), which is a consequence of (181). The latter estimate (hence both) can be proven by adapting the techniques from Dahmen et al. (2004).

---

[2] For notational convenience we interchanged the roles of d and $\tilde{d}$ as compared to, e.g., Stevenson (2004).

Now that we have settled on our main tool, we can start with *Proof of Theorem 6.1*. Let v be as in the theorem. Then first we estimate the part of Tv that is in S_Λ. We define the projection operator $Q_\Lambda : H^{-t}(\Omega) \to S_\Lambda$ by

$$Q_\Lambda \sum_{\lambda\in\nabla} w_\lambda \tilde{\psi}_\lambda = \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} w_\lambda \tilde{\psi}_\lambda. \tag{183}$$

In what follows, we will abbreviate the Sobolev norms as $\|\cdot\|_{s,\omega} = \|\cdot\|_{H^s(\omega)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_s = \|\cdot\|_{H^s(\Omega)}$.

Lemma 6.5 (Low frequency). *Let $s \geq 0$, and suppose that either $t > 0$ or $s+t > 0$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \|Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2_{s,\omega(z)} \lesssim \|v\|_t^2 \qquad \textit{for} \quad v \in H^t(\Omega). \tag{184}$$

Proof. First let $t \leq 0$, and therefore $s+t>0$. Then we have

$$\sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \|Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2_{s,\omega(z)} \lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} \|Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2_{-t,\omega(z)} \leq \|Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2_{-t} \lesssim \|Tv\|^2_{-t} \lesssim \|v\|_t^2, \tag{185}$$

where we have used in succession a standard inverse estimate, the super-additivity of the Sobolev norms (3), the stability of Q_Λ in H^{-t}, and the boundedness of T.

For the case $t > 0$, a standard inverse estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \|Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2_{s,\omega(z)} &\lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2t} \|Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2_{\omega(z)} = \sum_{z\in N_P} \|h_P^t Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2_{\omega(z)} \\ &\lesssim \|h_P^t Q_\Lambda Tv\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{186}$$

At this point we employ the inverse estimate (182), to get

$$\|h_P^t Q_\Lambda Tv\| \lesssim \|Q_\Lambda Tv\|_{-t} \lesssim \|Tv\|_{-t} \lesssim \|v\|_t, \tag{187}$$

concluding the proof. □

What remains now is to bound $(I - Q_\Lambda)Tv$, which consists of only high frequency wavelets compared to what is in $Q_\Lambda Tv \in S_\Lambda$. To this end, for $\lambda \in \Lambda^c := \nabla \setminus \Lambda$, let us define ℓ_λ by

$$2^{-\ell_\lambda} = \max\{h_\tau : \tau \in P,\, \tau\cap\Omega_\lambda \neq \varnothing\}, \tag{188}$$

so that in light of the norm equivalence (179), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \|(I-Q_\Lambda)Tv\|^2_{s,\omega(z)} &\lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \sum_{\{\lambda\in\Lambda^c:\Omega_\lambda\cap\omega(z)\neq\varnothing\}} 2^{2|\lambda|(s+t)} |(Tv)_\lambda|^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} \sum_{\{\lambda\in\Lambda^c:\Omega_\lambda\cap\omega(z)\neq\varnothing\}} 2^{-2\ell_\lambda(s+t)} 2^{2|\lambda|(s+t)} |(Tv)_\lambda|^2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda^c} 2^{2(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)} |(Tv)_\lambda|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{189}$$

where $(Tv)_\lambda = \langle Tv, \psi_\lambda\rangle$ is the coordinate of Tv with respect to $\tilde{\psi}_\lambda$, and in the last step we have taken into account the fact that each Ω_λ intersects with only a uniformly bounded number of stars $\omega(z)$. Hence our aim is to bound the last expression in (189) by $\|(v_\lambda)_\lambda\|^2_{\ell^2}$ for $v \in S_P$, where $v_\lambda = \langle v, \tilde{\psi}_\lambda\rangle$.

Before dealing with nonlocality of T, let us focus on the local properties. To this end, with $S_{P,z} = \{v \in S_P : v = 0 \text{ outside } \omega^3(z)\}$, define Q_z to be the L^2-orthogonal projector onto $S_{P,z}$ in case of piecewise constants, and otherwise to be the quasi-interpolation operator onto $S_{P,z}$, as discussed around (21). Here $\omega^k(z) = \omega(\omega^{k-1}(z))$ for $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 6.6 (Local interactions)**.** *Let $s \geq 0$ and let $t + s < \sigma$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \|(I - Q_\Lambda)TQ_z v\|^2_{s,\omega(z)} \lesssim \|v\|_t^2 \qquad \textit{for} \quad v \in S_P. \tag{190}$$

Proof. Replacing v with $Q_z v$ in (189), we get

$$\sum_{z\in N_P} h_z^{2(s+t)} \|(I - Q_\Lambda)TQ_z v\|^2_{s,\omega(z)} \lesssim \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda^c} 2^{2(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)} |(TQ_z v)_\lambda|^2. \tag{191}$$

In order to bound this, we view it as the (squared) $\ell^2(\Lambda^c)$-norm of a sequence, and we test the sequence against a general sequence $(w_\lambda)_\lambda \in \ell^2(\Lambda^c)$. As a preparation to this, for $w \in \operatorname{span}\{\psi_\lambda : |\lambda| = \ell\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle w, TQ_z v\rangle| &\lesssim \|w\|_{t-\sigma} \|TQ_z v\|_{-t+\sigma} \lesssim 2^{-\sigma\ell} \|w\|_t \|Q_z v\|_{t+\sigma} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\sigma\ell+(t+\sigma)\ell_z} \|w\|_t \|Q_z v\| \lesssim 2^{-\sigma\ell+(t+\sigma)\ell_z} \|w\|_t \|v\|_{\omega^3(z)}, \end{aligned} \tag{192}$$

where ℓ_z is defined by $2^{-\ell_z} = h_z$. Then assuming that $t \leq 0$, for $w = \sum_\lambda w_\lambda \psi_\lambda$ with $(w_\lambda)_\lambda \in \ell^2(\Lambda^c)$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda^c} 2^{(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)} (TQ_z v)_\lambda w_\lambda &\lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} \sum_{\ell \geq \ell_z + c} 2^{(\ell-\ell_z)(s+t)} \left| \left\langle \sum_{\{|\lambda|=\ell : \Omega_\lambda \cap \omega(z) \neq \varnothing\}} w_\lambda \psi_\lambda, TQ_z v \right\rangle \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} \sum_{\ell\geq\ell_z+c} 2^{(\ell-\ell_z)(s+t-\sigma)+\ell_z t} \left(\sum_{\{|\lambda|=\ell:\Omega_\lambda\cap\omega(z)\neq\varnothing\}} |w_\lambda|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{\omega^3(z)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{z\in N_P} 2^{\ell_z t} \left(\sum_{\{\lambda\in\Lambda^c:\Omega_\lambda\cap\omega(z)\neq\varnothing\}} |w_\lambda|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|v\|_{\omega^3(z)} \lesssim \|w\|_t \|h_P^{-t} v\| \lesssim \|w\|_t \|v\|_t, \end{aligned} \tag{193}$$

establishing the lemma.

The case $t > 0$ is proven similarly, by using

$$|\langle w, TQ_z v\rangle| \lesssim 2^{-\sigma\ell+\sigma\ell_z} \|w\|_t \|v\|_{t,\omega^3(z)}, \tag{194}$$

instead of (192). □

To deal with nonlocality of T, we will employ the Schur test, whose proof we include here for convenience.

Lemma 6.7 (Schur test)**.** *Let Λ and M be countable sets, and let $\ell^p(\Lambda, w)$ be the weighted ℓ^p-space with the norm*

$$\|v\|_{\ell^p(\Lambda,w)} = \|\{v_\lambda w_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\|_{\ell^p(\Lambda)}, \tag{195}$$

where $\{w_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a given positive sequence of weights. For a matrix with entries $T_{\lambda\mu}$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\mu \in M$, we consider its boundedness as a linear operator $T : \ell^p(M) \to \ell^p(\Lambda, w)$. Suppose that there exist two positive sequences $\{\theta_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ and $\{\omega_\mu\}_{\mu\in M}$, and two numbers $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sum_{\mu\in M} |T_{\lambda\mu}|\omega_\mu^q \le \alpha^q\theta_\lambda^q, \qquad \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |T_{\lambda\mu}|w_\lambda^p\theta_\lambda^p \le \beta^p\omega_\mu^p, \tag{196}$$

where $1 < p < \infty$ and q satisfies $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Then we have

$$\|T\|_{\ell^p(M)\to\ell^p(\Lambda,w)} \le \alpha\beta. \tag{197}$$

Proof. Let $v \in \ell^p(M)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(Tv)_\lambda| &\le \sum_{\mu\in M} \omega_\mu\omega_\mu^{-1}|T_{\lambda\mu}||v_\mu| \le \left(\sum_{\mu\in M} |T_{\lambda\mu}|\omega_\mu^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\sum_{\mu\in M} |T_{\lambda\mu}|\omega_\mu^{-p}|v_\mu|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\le \alpha\theta_\lambda \left(\sum_{\mu\in M} |T_{\lambda\mu}|\omega_\mu^{-p}|v_\mu|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \end{aligned} \tag{198}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tv\|_{\ell^p(\Lambda,w)}^p &= \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |(Tv)_\lambda|^p w_\lambda^p \le \alpha^p \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \theta_\lambda^p w_\lambda^p \sum_{\mu\in M} |T_{\lambda\mu}|\omega_\mu^{-p}|v_\mu|^p \\ &= \alpha^p \sum_{\mu\in M} \omega_\mu^{-p}|v_\mu|^p \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} |T_{\lambda\mu}|\theta_\lambda^p w_\lambda^p \le \alpha^p \sum_{\mu\in M} \omega_\mu^{-p}|v_\mu|^p\beta^p\omega_\mu^p \\ &= \alpha^p\beta^p\|v\|_{\ell^p(M)}^p, \end{aligned} \tag{199}$$

establishing the boundedness of $T : \ell^p(M) \to \ell^p(\Lambda, w)$. □

With the Riesz bases $\Psi \subset H^t(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{\Psi} \subset H^{-t}(\Omega)$ at hand, the operator $T : H^t(\Omega) \to H^{-t}(\Omega)$ can be thought of as the bi-infinite matrix $T : \ell^2(\nabla) \to \ell^2(\nabla)$ with the elements $T_{\lambda\mu} = \langle\psi_\lambda, T\psi_\mu\rangle$. The following estimate on these elements, established in Stevenson (2004), will be crucial:

$$|T_{\lambda\mu}| = |\langle\psi_\lambda, T\psi_\mu\rangle| \lesssim \left(\frac{2^{-||\lambda|-|\mu||/2}}{\delta(\lambda, \mu)}\right)^{n+2t+2d} \tag{200}$$

where

$$\delta(\lambda,\mu) = 2^{\min\{|\lambda|,|\mu|\}}\mathrm{dist}(\Omega_\lambda,\Omega_\mu). \tag{201}$$

See also Schneider (1998) and Dahmen and Stevenson (1999) for earlier derivations for less general cases.

The following result shows that the far-field terms behave rather well. Note that the condition $d+t>0$ is immaterial to us since we can choose d at will.

Lemma 6.8 (Far-field interactions)**.** *Define the operator* $F: H^t(\Omega)\to H^{-t}(\Omega)$ *with matrix elements* $F_{\lambda\mu} = T_{\lambda\mu}$ *for* $\lambda\in\Lambda^c$ *and* $\mu\in\nabla$ *satisfying* $\mathrm{dist}(\Omega_\lambda,\Omega_\mu)\geq\delta\max\{2^{-\ell_\lambda},2^{-|\mu|}\}$, *and* $F_{\lambda\mu}=0$ *otherwise. Let* $s+t>0$ *and* $d+t>0$*. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda^c} 2^{2(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)}|(Fv)_\lambda|^2 \lesssim \|v\|_t^2 \qquad \textit{for} \quad v\in H^t(\Omega). \tag{202}$$

Proof. We apply the Schur test (Lemma 6.7) with $\theta_\lambda^2 = 2^{-|\lambda|n/2-(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(d+t)}$, $\omega_\mu^2 = 2^{-|\mu|n/2}$, and $w_\lambda = 2^{(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)}$. First we shall bound

$$\sum_{\mu\in\nabla}|F_{\lambda\mu}|2^{-|\mu|n/2} \lesssim \sum_m 2^{-mn/2}\sum_{\{|\mu|=m,\,F_{\lambda\mu}\neq 0\}}\left(\frac{2^{-||\lambda|-m|/2}}{\delta(\lambda,\mu)}\right)^{n+2t+2d}, \tag{203}$$

by a multiple of θ_λ^2. In the inner sum, we must sum over all μ such that $\delta(\lambda,\mu)\gtrsim 2^{|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda}$ when $|\mu|=m\geq|\lambda|$, and such that $\delta(\lambda,\mu)\gtrsim 2^{\max\{0,m-\ell_\lambda\}}$ when $|\mu|=m\leq|\lambda|$. By locality of the wavelets and the Lipschitz property Ω, for $\lambda\in\nabla$, $m\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\beta>0$, we have

$$\sum_{\{\mu:|\mu|=m,\,\delta(\lambda,\mu)\geq R\}}\delta(\lambda,\mu)^{-(n+\beta)} \lesssim R^{-\beta}2^{n\max\{0,m-|\lambda|\}}, \tag{204}$$

which appears, e.g., in Stevenson (2004). This gives

$$\sum_{\{\mu:|\mu|=m,\,\delta(\lambda,\mu)\gtrsim 2^{|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda}\}}\delta(\lambda,\mu)^{-(n+2t+2d)} \lesssim 2^{-(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(2d+2t)+(m-|\lambda|)n/2}, \tag{205}$$

for $m\geq|\lambda|$, and

$$\sum_{\{\mu:|\mu|=m,\,\delta(\lambda,\mu)\gtrsim 2^{\max\{0,m-\ell_\lambda\}}\}}\delta(\lambda,\mu)^{-(n+2t+2d)} \lesssim 2^{-(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(d+t)+(m-|\lambda|)n/2}, \tag{206}$$

for $m\leq|\lambda|$. By using the preceding estimates, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mu\in\nabla}|F_{\lambda\mu}|2^{-|\mu|n/2} &\lesssim \sum_{m\leq|\lambda|}2^{-(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(d+t)-(|\lambda|-m)(d+t)-|\lambda|n/2}\\ &\quad+\sum_{m>|\lambda|}2^{-(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(2d+2t)-(m-|\lambda|)(d+t)-|\lambda|n/2}\\ &\lesssim 2^{-|\lambda|n/2-(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(d+t)}.\end{aligned} \tag{207}$$

Now we shall bound

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda^c} w_\lambda^2\theta_\lambda^2|F_{\lambda\mu}| \lesssim \sum_\ell \sum_{\{|\lambda|=\ell,\, F_{\lambda\mu}\neq 0\}} 2^{(\ell-\ell_\lambda)(2s+t-d)}2^{-\ell n/2}\left(\frac{2^{-|\ell-|\mu||/2}}{\delta(\lambda,\mu)}\right)^{n+2t+2d}, \tag{208}$$

by a multiple of ω_μ^2. By construction, for $\lambda\in\Lambda^c$ and $\mu\in\nabla$ with $F_{\lambda\mu}\neq 0$, we have $2^{-\min\{\ell_\lambda,|\mu|\}}\lesssim \operatorname{dist}(\Omega_\lambda,\Omega_\mu)$, implying that

$$2^{-\ell_\lambda}\lesssim \operatorname{dist}(\Omega_\lambda,\Omega_\mu), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \operatorname{dist}(\Omega_\lambda,\Omega_\mu)\gtrsim 2^{-\min\{|\lambda|,|\mu|\}}. \tag{209}$$

In particular, the second estimate tells us that $\delta(\lambda,\mu)\gtrsim 1$ in the (inner) sum in (208). So for $\ell\leq|\mu|$, we estimate the inner sum as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{|\lambda|=\ell} 2^{(\ell-\ell_\lambda)(2s+t-d)}2^{-\ell n/2}|F_{\lambda\mu}| &\leq \sum_{|\lambda|=\ell} 2^{2(\ell-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)}2^{-\ell n/2}|F_{\lambda\mu}| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\{|\lambda|=\ell,\,\delta(\lambda,\mu)\gtrsim 1\}} \delta(\lambda,\mu)^{2(s+t)}2^{-\ell n/2}\left(\frac{2^{-(|\mu|-\ell)/2}}{\delta(\lambda,\mu)}\right)^{n+2t+2d} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\ell n/2}2^{-(|\mu|-\ell)(n/2+t+d)} = 2^{-(|\mu|-\ell)(t+d)}2^{-|\mu|n/2},\end{aligned} \tag{210}$$

where we have used $\ell\geq\ell_\lambda$ and $d+t>0$ in the first inequality, and $s+t>0$ in the second. Assuming that $2s+t-d\leq 0$, for $\ell\geq|\mu|$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{|\lambda|=\ell} 2^{(\ell-\ell_\lambda)(2s+t-d)}2^{-\ell n/2}|F_{\lambda\mu}| &\leq \sum_{|\lambda|=\ell} 2^{-\ell n/2}|F_{\lambda\mu}| \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\ell n/2}2^{-(\ell-|\mu|)(n/2+t+d)}2^{(\ell-|\mu|)n} \\ &= 2^{-(\ell-|\mu|)(d+t)}2^{-|\mu|n/2}.\end{aligned} \tag{211}$$

Now if $2s+t-d>0$, for $\ell\geq|\mu|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{|\lambda|=\ell} 2^{(\ell-\ell_\lambda)(2s+t-d)}2^{-\ell n/2}|F_{\lambda\mu}| &\lesssim \sum_{|\lambda|=\ell} 2^{(\ell-|\mu|)(2s+t-d)}\delta(\lambda,\mu)^{2s+t-d}2^{-\ell n/2}|F_{\lambda\mu}| \\ &\lesssim 2^{(\ell-|\mu|)(2s+t-d)}2^{-\ell n/2}2^{-(\ell-|\mu|)(n/2+t+d)}2^{(\ell-|\mu|)n} \\ &= 2^{-(\ell-|\mu|)(2d-2s)}2^{-|\mu|n/2}.\end{aligned} \tag{212}$$

From the geometric decay of the preceding estimates, we infer

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda^c} 2^{(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(2s+t-d)}2^{-|\lambda|n/2}|F_{\lambda\mu}| \lesssim 2^{-|\mu|n/2}, \tag{213}$$

which completes the proof. □

For the remaining terms, i.e., for the near-field terms, we employ the simple estimate

$$\langle \psi_\lambda, T\psi_\mu \rangle \lesssim \|\psi_\lambda\|_{t-\sigma} \|T\psi_\mu\|_{-t+\sigma} \lesssim \|\psi_\lambda\|_{t-\sigma} \|\psi_\mu\|_{t+\sigma} \lesssim 2^{-|\lambda|\sigma+|\mu|\sigma}. \tag{214}$$

We will see that this estimate gives sub-optimal results, that in general require the manifold Ω to be smoother than Lipschitz. There exist sharper estimates in the literature, cf. Stevenson (2004); Dahmen et al. (2006), that exploit the piecewise smooth nature of the wavelets. However, the author was not able to make use of them to get better results. The best attempts so far by using the estimates from Dahmen et al. (2006) resulted in logarithmic divergences, and the estimates from Stevenson (2004) in general need Ω to be smoother than Lipschitz, thus do not seem to give improvements in this regard.

Lemma 6.9 (Near-field interactions)**.** *Define the operator $N : H^t(\Omega) \to H^{-t}(\Omega)$ with matrix elements $N_{\lambda\mu} = T_{\lambda\mu}$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda^c$ and $\mu \in \nabla$ satisfying* $\operatorname{dist}(\Omega_\lambda, \Omega_\mu) \leq 2^{-|\mu|}$ *and $|\mu| \leq \ell_\lambda$, and $N_{\lambda\mu} = 0$ otherwise. Let $2\sigma > n$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^c} 2^{2(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)} |(Nv)_\lambda|^2 \lesssim \|v\|_t^2 \qquad \textit{for} \quad v \in S_P. \tag{215}$$

Proof. We apply the Schur test (Lemma 6.7) with $\theta_\lambda^2 = 2^{\varepsilon\ell_\lambda - \sigma|\lambda|}$, $\omega_\mu^2 = 2^{(\varepsilon-\sigma)|\mu|}$, and $w_\lambda = 2^{(|\lambda|-\ell_\lambda)(s+t)}$, where $\varepsilon = 2\sigma - n > 0$. We have

$$\sum_{\mu \in \nabla} |N_{\lambda\mu}| 2^{(\varepsilon-\sigma)|\mu|} \lesssim \sum_{m \leq \ell_\lambda} 2^{-\sigma|\lambda| + \varepsilon m} \lesssim 2^{\varepsilon\ell_\lambda - \sigma|\lambda|}, \tag{216}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^c} w_\lambda^2 \theta_\lambda^2 |N_{\lambda\mu}| &\lesssim \sum_{\{\tau \in P : \operatorname{dist}(\tau, \Omega_\mu) \leq 2^{-|\mu|}\}} \sum_{\ell \geq \ell_\tau} 2^{2(\ell-\ell_\tau)(s+t)} 2^{\varepsilon\ell_\tau - \sigma\ell} 2^{-\sigma(\ell-|\mu|)} 2^{n(\ell-\ell_\tau)} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\{\tau \in P : \operatorname{dist}(\tau, \Omega_\mu) \leq 2^{-|\mu|}\}} 2^{\varepsilon\ell_\tau - \sigma\ell_\tau} 2^{-\sigma(\ell_\tau - |\mu|)} \\
&= \sum_{\{\tau \in P : \operatorname{dist}(\tau, \Omega_\mu) \leq 2^{-|\mu|}\}} 2^{\sigma|\mu| - n\ell_\tau} \lesssim \sum_{\{\tau \in P : \operatorname{dist}(\tau, \Omega_\mu) \leq 2^{-|\mu|}\}} 2^{\sigma|\mu|} \operatorname{vol}(\tau) \\
&\lesssim 2^{(\sigma-n)|\mu|} = 2^{(\varepsilon-\sigma)|\mu|},
\end{aligned} \tag{217}$$

which establishes the proof. □

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is complete, as choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough, the combination of the local, far-field and near-field interactions accounts for the high frequency part $(I - Q_\Lambda)Tv$, while the low frequency part $Q_\Lambda Tv$ is taken care of by Lemma 6.5.

7 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we proved geometric error reduction for three kinds of adaptive boundary element methods for positive, negative, as well as zero order operator equations, without relying on a saturation-type assumption. In fact, several types of saturation assumptions follow from our work as a corollary. Moreover, bounds on the convergence rates are obtained that are in a certain sense optimal.

We established several new global- and local discrete bounds for a number of residual-type error estimators for positive, negative, as well zero order boundary integral equations, including the estimators from Carstensen, Maischak, and Stephan (2001), Carstensen, Maischak, Praetorius, and Stephan (2004), and Faermann (2000, 2002). Some of our bounds contain oscillation terms, that give useful estimates on how far the current mesh is from saturation. In order to handle the oscillation terms, which turned out to be much more involved than the corresponding affairs in the finite element context, we introduced an inverse-type inequality involving boundary integral operators and locally refined meshes. Our proof of the inequality in general requires the underlying surface Γ to be $C^{1,1}$ or smoother, but for open surfaces it allows the boundary of Γ to be Lipschitz. So in general, polyhedral surfaces are ruled out, which is likely an artifact of the proof, and will hopefully be rectified in the near future.

The current work gives rise to its fair share of open problems, and re-emphasizes some existing ones. The following is an attempt at identifying the most pressing of them.

- to prove the inverse-type inequality in §6 for polyhedral surfaces.
- to characterize the approximation classes associated to the proposed adaptive BEMs.
- to extend the analysis to transmission problems, and adaptive FEM-BEM coupling.
- complexity analysis, i.e., the problem of quadrature and linear algebra solvers.
- convergence rate for adaptive BEMs based on non-residual type error estimators.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Dirk Praetorius for carefully reading an earlier version of this manuscript, and for making several important comments that substantially improved the quality of this paper. Particularly, Dirk pointed out a flaw in an earlier argument for optimality in Section 5. I would also like to thank Michael Renardy, Nilima Nigam, and Elias Pipping over at `mathoverflow.net` for pointing out the reference Kim (2007), and Doyoon Kim for kindly making his paper available to me. This work is supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant and an FQRNT Nouveaux Chercheurs Grant.

References

Mark Ainsworth, William McLean, and Thanh Tran. The conditioning of boundary element equations on locally refined meshes and preconditioning by diagonal scaling. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 36(6):1901–1932 (electronic), 1999. ISSN 0036-1429. doi: 10.1137/S0036142997330809. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036142997330809`.

Markus Aurada, Samuel Ferraz-Leite, and Dirk Praetorius. Estimator reduction and convergence of adaptive BEM. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 2011. URL `http://publik.tuwien.ac.at/showentry.php?ID=185100`. To appear.

Christine Bernardi and Vivette Girault. A local regularization operator for triangular and quadrilateral finite elements. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35(5):1893–1916, 1998. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036142995293766`.

Peter Binev, Wolfgang Dahmen, and Ron DeVore. Adaptive finite element methods with convergence rates. *Numer. Math.*, 97(2):219–268, 2004. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00211-003-0492-7`.

Carsten Carstensen and Birgit Faermann. Mathematical foundation of a posteriori error estimates and adaptive mesh-refining algorithms for boundary integral equations of the first kind. *Engineering Analysis with Boundary Elements*, 25(7):497 – 509, 2001. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0955-7997(01)00012-1`.

Carsten Carstensen and Dirk Praetorius. Convergence of adaptive boundary element methods. *ASC Report 15/2009*, 2009. URL `http://publik.tuwien.ac.at/showentry.php?ID=175946`. Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing, Vienna University of Technology, Wien.

Carsten Carstensen, Matthias Maischak, and Ernst P. Stephan. A posteriori error estimate and h-adaptive algorithm on surfaces for Symm's integral equation. *Numer. Math.*, 90 (2):197–213, 2001. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002110100287`.

Carsten Carstensen, Matthias Maischak, Dirk Praetorius, and Ernst P. Stephan. Residual-based a posteriori error estimate for hypersingular equation on surfaces. *Numer. Math.*, 97(3):397–425, 2004. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00211-003-0506-5`.

J. Manuel Cascon, Christian Kreuzer, Ricardo H. Nochetto, and Kunibert G. Siebert. Quasi-optimal convergence rate for an adaptive finite element method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(5):2524–2550, 2008. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/07069047X`.

Philippe P. J. E. Clément. Approximation by finite element functions using local regularization. *Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. RAIRO Analyse Numérique*, 9(R-2):77–84, 1975.

Martin Costabel. Boundary integral operators on Lipschitz domains: elementary results. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 19(3):613–626, 1988. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0519043`.

Wolfgang Dahmen and Reinhold Schneider. Wavelets on manifolds. I. Construction and domain decomposition. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 31(1):184–230, 1999. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036141098333451`.

Wolfgang Dahmen and Rob Stevenson. Element-by-element construction of wavelets satisfying stability and moment conditions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 37(1):319–352, 1999. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036142997330949`.

Wolfgang Dahmen, Birgit Faermann, Ivan G. Graham, Wolfgang Hackbusch, and Stefan A. Sauter. Inverse inequalities on non-quasi-uniform meshes and application to the mortar element method. *Math. Comp.*, 73(247):1107–1138, 2004. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-03-01583-7`.

Wolfgang Dahmen, Helmut Harbrecht, and Reinhold Schneider. Compression techniques for boundary integral equations—asymptotically optimal complexity estimates. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(6):2251–2271, 2006. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036142903428852`.

Zhonghai Ding. A proof of the trace theorem of Sobolev spaces on Lipschitz domains. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 124(2):591–600, 1996. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-96-03132-2`.

Willy Dörfler. A convergent adaptive algorithm for Poisson's equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(3):1106–1124, 1996. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0733054`.

Christoph Erath, Samuel Ferraz-Leite, Stefan A. Funken, and Dirk Praetorius. Energy norm based a posteriori error estimation for boundary element methods in two dimensions. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 59(11):2713–2734, 2009a. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apnum.2008.12.024`.

Christoph Erath, Stefan A. Funken, Petra Goldenits, and Dirk Praetorius. Simple error estimators for the Galerkin BEM for some hypersingular integral equationin 2D. *ASC Report 20/2009*, 2009b. URL `http://publik.tuwien.ac.at/showentry.php?ID=176588`. Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing, Vienna University of Technology, Wien.

Birgit Faermann. Local a-posteriori error indicators for the Galerkin discretization of boundary integral equations. *Numer. Math.*, 79(1):43–76, 1998. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002110050331`.

Birgit Faermann. Localization of the Aronszajn-Slobodeckij norm and application to adaptive boundary element methods. I. The two-dimensional case. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 20 (2):203–234, 2000. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/imanum/20.2.203`.

Birgit Faermann. Localization of the Aronszajn-Slobodeckij norm and application to adaptive boundary element methods. II. The three-dimensional case. *Numer. Math.*, 92(3): 467–499, 2002. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002110100319`.

Michael Feischl, Michael Karkulik, Jens M. Melenk, and Dirk Praetorius. Residual a-posteriori error estimates in BEM: Convergence of h-adaptive algorithms. *ASC Report 21/2011*, 2011. URL `http://publik.tuwien.ac.at/showentry.php?ID=197313`. Institute for Analysis and Scientific Computing, Vienna University of Technology, Wien.

Samuel Ferraz-Leite, Christoph Ortner, and Dirk Praetorius. Convergence of simple adaptive Galerkin schemes based on $h-h/2$ error estimators. *Numer. Math.*, 116(2):291–316, 2010. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00211-010-0292-9`.

Tsogtgerel Gantumur. An optimal adaptive wavelet method for nonsymmetric and indefinite elliptic problems. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 211(1):90–102, 2008. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2006.11.013`.

H. Johnen and K. Scherer. On the equivalence of the K-functional and moduli of continuity and some applications. In *Constructive theory of functions of several variables (Proc. Conf., Math. Res. Inst., Oberwolfach, 1976)*, pages 119–140. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 571. Springer, Berlin, 1977.

Doyoon Kim. Trace theorems for Sobolev-Slobodeckij spaces with or without weights. *J. Funct. Spaces Appl.*, 5(3):243–268, 2007.

Jürgen Marschall. The trace of Sobolev-Slobodeckij spaces on Lipschitz domains. *Manuscripta Math.*, 58(1-2):47–65, 1987. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01169082`.

William McLean. *Strongly elliptic systems and boundary integral equations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

Khamron Mekchay and Ricardo H. Nochetto. Convergence of adaptive finite element methods for general second order linear elliptic PDEs. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 43(5): 1803–1827, 2005. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/04060929X`.

Pedro Morin, Ricardo H. Nochetto, and Kunibert G. Siebert. Convergence of adaptive finite element methods. *SIAM Rev.*, 44(4):631–658, 2002. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036144502409093`. Revised reprint of “Data oscillation and convergence of adaptive FEM” [SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **3**8 (2000), no. 2, 466–488].

Ricardo H. Nochetto, Tobias von Petersdorff, and Chen-Song Zhang. A posteriori error analysis for a class of integral equations and variational inequalities. *Numer. Math.*, 116 (3):519–552, 2010. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00211-010-0310-y`.

Peter Oswald. *Multilevel finite element approximation.* Teubner Skripten zur Numerik. [Teubner Scripts on Numerical Mathematics]. B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1994. ISBN 3-519-02719-4. Theory and applications.

Stefan A. Sauter and Christoph Schwab. *Boundary element methods*, volume 39 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011. Translated and expanded from the 2004 German original.

Reinhold Schneider. *Multiskalen- und Wavelet-Matrixkompression.* Advances in Numerical Mathematics. B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1998. Analysisbasierte Methoden zur effizienten Lösung großer vollbesetzter Gleichungssysteme. (Analysis-based methods for the efficient solution of large nonsparse systems of equations).

L. Ridgway Scott and Shangyou Zhang. Finite element interpolation of nonsmooth functions satisfying boundary conditions. *Math. Comp.*, 54(190):483–493, 1990. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2008497`.

Rob Stevenson. Locally supported, piecewise polynomial biorthogonal wavelets on nonuniform meshes. *Constr. Approx.*, 19(4):477–508, 2003. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00365-003-0545-2`.

Rob Stevenson. On the compressibility of operators in wavelet coordinates. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 35(5):1110–1132, 2004. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036141002411520`.

Rob Stevenson. An optimal adaptive finite element method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 42 (5):2188–2217, 2005. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S0036142903425082`.

Rob Stevenson. Optimality of a standard adaptive finite element method. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 7(2):245–269, 2007. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10208-005-0183-0`.

Rob Stevenson. The completion of locally refined simplicial partitions created by bisection. *Math. Comp.*, 77(261):227–241, 2008. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-07-01959-X`.

Gregory Verchota. Layer potentials and regularity for the Dirichlet problem for Laplace's equation in Lipschitz domains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 59(3):572–611, 1984. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1236(84)90066-1`.

Tobias von Petersdorff. *Randwertprobleme der Elastizitätstheorie für Polyeder: Singularitäten und Approximation mit Randelementmethoden.* PhD thesis, Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, Switzerland, 1989.